



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2013

No. 65

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

Sister Jacquelyn Gusdane, SND, Notre Dame-Cathedral Latin School, Chardon, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Creating God, this day we are surrounded by the immensity of Your universe as spring unfolds before us. You continually bestow hints of Your beauty, creative power, abundance, goodness, and provident care. You say to us, "Look around and rejoice as new life bursts forth."

With this perspective, we embrace our work this day. We come before You as men and women committed to the trust given to us by our Nation. Led by Your Spirit, we beg You to open our minds and hearts to our responsibilities; teach us how to exercise wisdom, courage, and our gifts for the common good by arriving at workable and reasonable solutions.

May our actions result in greater charity, justice, and the transformation of our world.

With Your guidance, this is our hope and prayer as we accept our call to serve as restorers of new life and give glory to You.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### WELCOMING SISTER JACQUELYN GUSDANE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Sister Jacquelyn Gusdane for leading the House in prayer and for making this trip from Chardon, Ohio. It was a beautiful prayer, and it's an absolute honor to have her here today.

I first met Sister Jacquelyn at Notre Dame-Cathedral Latin School in Chardon, where she is the president and all three of my children attended high school. Sister Jacquelyn is a model of grace, compassion, and humility, and I feel very lucky to have had my three kids under her watch.

Sister Jacquelyn leads a life of service, volunteering at WomenSafe in Geauga County, at the Hospice of the Western Reserve, and countless other schools, organizations, and churches in northeast Ohio.

She's also taken her service beyond our borders, making a trip to the Holy

Land, to Israel and Jordan, and traveling to China, Brazil, El Salvador, Germany, and many other nations.

At NDCL, under her leadership, this small parochial school has allowed many children of middle class families such as ours to enjoy their college preparatory education while becoming leaders in the community, all the while keeping true to the mission of living the truth through love.

Sister Jacquelyn, it's an honor and a privilege to have you here this morning, and thank you very much for leading the House of Representatives in prayer.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The Chair will entertain five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### THE PAST CAME ALIVE YESTERDAY

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our House Speaker indicated that it was our high honor to host Her Excellency, the President of the Republic of Korea. She expressed profound gratitude to us for our friendship with Korea and shared with us improvements realized by her country since the guns fell silent in 1953.

Many refer to the Korean war as the "Forgotten War," but, Mr. Speaker, there was no evidence on Capitol Hill yesterday to suggest that this war has been forgotten.

The Korean President referred to this Chamber as "this hallowed ground of freedom and democracy." The past came alive yesterday as our Congress hosted this very distinguished leader from Korea.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2537

## ENHANCING EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING THROUGH EDUCATION ACT

(Ms. DELBENE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, today I'm proud to introduce the bipartisan Enhancing Employment and Training through Education Act.

This bill will help improve access to opportunity for struggling families by helping people get jobs and an education while reducing the need for government assistance. It will spur pilot projects across the country, modeled after my home State of Washington's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program's employment and training program.

Washington's program is an extraordinary example because it provides targeted education services leading to economic self-sufficiency. This focused strategy helps participants gain the necessary skills to succeed in their careers.

Even at the height of the recession, when jobs were scarce, 60 percent of those enrolled in Washington's programs found employment. In one study, less than half of the participants remained on government assistance 2 years after starting the program.

This jobs bill is a prime example of how the government can spend a little money now and save a lot in the future. I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

## MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

(Mr. BRIDENSTINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 684, the Marketplace Fairness Act.

Imagine if a State had the authority to reach beyond its borders into another State and compel a business in the other State to collect and remit taxes.

Imagine a business being forced to collect and remit taxes for over 9,600 different local tax jurisdictions, and being open to audit by 50 different States, yet only having representation in one of those tax jurisdictions.

This law would overturn a foundational American principle of no taxation without representation.

Imagine the same business losing market share to offshore businesses that cannot be compelled by Congress to collect taxes for local jurisdictions in the U.S. Now, imagine that business either closing its doors or leaving the country in order to compete.

The unintended consequences of the Marketplace Fairness Act have not been considered. I understand why some people support it, but this bill is not the right solution.

## CELEBRATING NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, this week we're celebrating National Nurses Week. As a doctor, and on behalf of physicians all across this Nation, I want to salute the over 3 million registered nurses for their service to our patients. The partnership between physicians and nurses is critical to ensuring America's health, and this partnership will become even more important as we move to contain the cost of health care.

America's nurses will be key to making sure that every patient in America has access to affordable health care. So on this National Nurses Week, this doctor chooses to salute nurses everywhere for their service to America's patients. Thank you.

□ 0910

## WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Defense, in 2011, there were an estimated 19,000 victims of sexual violence in the military; however, only 2,700 servicemembers actually filed a sexual assault report. These numbers are daunting and completely inexcusable.

Earlier this week, I was proud to introduce bipartisan legislation with Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ. This bill strengthens whistleblower protections for military sexual assault victims. These protections ensure victims of sexual crimes have the same rights as other military whistleblowers.

Today, we have the opportunity to provide servicemen and -women with the peace of mind that they can report sexual violence without fear of retaliation. I encourage all my colleagues to support H.R. 1864 and help eradicate sexual violence from the Armed Forces.

## KEEPING ALL STUDENTS SAFE ACT

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Keeping All Students Safe Act to protect schoolchildren from abusive seclusion and restraint practices. These practices are at best cruel and at worst deadly, and they continue to be used in schools on children across the country.

In Indiana, an 8-year-old girl with Down syndrome had her shoes duct-

taped painfully to her ankles because she refused to put her shoes on. In North Carolina, a 14-year-old boy with a traumatic brain injury was confined inside a cardboard box as a form of time-out.

In Minnesota, a 10-year-old boy with autism was pinned face down on the floor for 57 minutes by three staff members at his school after a tantrum he had while working on a puzzle. And in Virginia, a 13-year-old boy was placed in solitary confinement for 3 hours after he threw his lunch.

In some cases, children have even died with these improper restraints. My bill would stop these abusive practices. Congress needs to act. There's no room for torture in America's schools.

## AFFORDABLE CARE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, we need to amend a fundamentally unfair provision within the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, better known as ObamaCare. That is, many of the very people who have been responsible for writing, advocating for, passing, signing into law, and promulgating rules governing the implementation of ObamaCare are exempt from the coverage requirements mandated by this law.

That is why I am introducing the Affordable Care Accountability Act. This legislation will require the President, the Vice President, all of the Cabinet Secretaries, all political appointees, all Members of Congress, and all congressional staff, including those from committees and leadership, to receive their health care insurance coverage through the insurance exchanges required under ObamaCare.

Americans deserve to know that their government officials will never seek to pass legislation only to exempt themselves from all of its provisions.

## HONORING BILL JENNINGS, GUARDIAN OF THE SAN JOAQUIN DELTA

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of one of my constituents, Bill Jennings. Mr. Jennings has a long and storied resume. Currently, he is the executive director and chairman of the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, a board member of the California Water Impact Network, and an executive committee member of Restore the Delta, a group that educates the public about the importance of the San Joaquin Delta.

Mr. Jennings has been recognized numerous times for his work on behalf of our environment and has received

many awards, including the International Conservation Award from the Federation of Fly Fishers and the Director's Achievement Award from the California Department of Fish and Game.

Mr. Jennings is an outspoken guardian of the San Joaquin Delta, and I admire his tireless dedication to protecting water quality in our environment. Bill Jennings reminds us of the importance of taking action to safeguard our treasured natural resources for generations to come.

It's been an honor to know Mr. Jennings, and it's encouraging to know that people like Mr. Jennings are out there working on our behalf.

#### IMMIGRATION

(Mr. BROOKS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, while America has the world's most generous immigration policy, we simply lack the resources to accept all the world's immigrants into America. The President and Senate Gang of Eight push an amnesty bill that, per The Heritage Foundation, costs American taxpayers a 50-year net tax loss of \$6.3 trillion. That's a net tax loss of \$126 billion per year—enough to eliminate sequestration.

In April 2013, a Pew Center poll revealed that 20 percent of all Mexicans—that's 22 million Mexicans—say they want to illegally immigrate to America if they can get away with it.

America cannot afford to open these massive floodgates anymore than we can afford an amnesty plan that rewards illegal conduct while adding \$6.3 trillion to America's already dangerous and exploding national debt—a debt, I might add, that is already doing significant damage to America's economy and national security.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF WALTER "FINCH" KWIECINSKI OF DULUTH, MINNESOTA

(Mr. WALZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and sacrifice of Walter "Finch" Kwiecinski of Duluth, Minnesota.

Walter's story is the story of his generation and should make each of us reflect on the sacrifices that were made to allow us the precious gift of democracy and self-government.

Born in 1914 on a farm near Duluth, Minnesota, to Polish immigrants, Walter enlisted in the Army at Fort Snelling, Minnesota, on February 6, 1941. After basic training, he was sent to Fort Mills on Corregidor Island in the Philippines.

Walter manned a 12-inch mortar on Battery Way and fought valiantly to

repel the Japanese invasion of Bataan and Corregidor. Standing until the very end with his unit sustaining 77 percent casualty rates, Walter fought on until May 6, 1941, when Corregidor fell and General Wainwright cabled these words to President Roosevelt:

There is a limit of human endurance, and that point has long passed.

Walter was taken prisoner by the Japanese and survived hellish conditions in POW camps and transport on the "hell ships" to be slave labor in Japan. His family presumed him dead. He was liberated in August 1945 and returned home December 5, 1945.

He then humbly set about going back to work as a mechanic. Marrying Mary Anne Krebs, he raised a beautiful family and lived a life of dignity. Yesterday, May 8, marked the 25th anniversary of Walter Kwiecinski's death. We should all be thankful for his life.

□ 0920

#### FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 202, I call up the bill (H.R. 807) to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 202, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 807

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Full Faith and Credit Act".*

#### SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST ON PUBLIC DEBT AND SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—In the event that the debt of the United States Government, as defined in section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, reaches the statutory limit, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in addition to any other authority provided by law, issue obligations under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, to pay with legal tender, and solely for the purpose of paying, the principal and interest on obligations of the United States described in subsection (b) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) *OBLIGATIONS DESCRIBED.*—For purposes of this subsection, obligations described in this subsection are obligations which are—

(1) held by the public, or

(2) held by the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

(c) *OBLIGATIONS EXEMPT FROM PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.*—Obligations issued under subsection (a) shall not be taken into account in applying the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, to the extent that such obligation would otherwise cause the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, to be exceeded.

#### (d) REPORT ON CERTAIN ACTIONS.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—If, after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury exercises his authority under subsection (a), the Secretary shall thereafter submit a report each week providing an accounting relating to—

(A) the principal on mature obligations and interest that is due or accrued of the United States, and

(B) any obligations issued pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) *SUBMISSION.*—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(3) *TERMINATION.*—The report requirement under paragraph (1) shall cease to apply after the date of the enactment of the first increase in the limitation in section 3101(b), United States Code, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 113-52, if offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 807.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act. This legislation credibly and permanently removes the threat of default on a U.S. debt payment and ensures that Social Security benefits are paid in full and on time.

The bill is really quite simple: it requires the Treasury Department to issue debt not subject to the statutory limit to make principal and interest payments. And here are the facts about who holds that debt: American families and businesses hold the overwhelming majority of U.S. debt—teacher pension funds, individual Americans, our military retirement fund, and the list goes on and on. So by ensuring that Treasury has the ability to honor our debt obligations, we are in fact ensuring Americans will be paid.

This legislation is the first step in protecting our credit rating. Two major credit rating agencies—Standard and Poor's and Moody's—have indicated that they differentiate between the debt and other payments when determining whether or not to review our credit rating. To that end, this bill specifically addresses the default on U.S.

debt obligations that these agencies have identified.

Additionally, Standard & Poor's was crystal clear as to why it downgraded the U.S. credit rating following the debt negotiations in the summer of 2011, and I quote:

The downgrade reflects our opinion that the fiscal consolidation plan that Congress and the administration recently agreed to falls short of what, in our view, would be necessary to stabilize the government's medium-term debt dynamics.

In plain English, they downgraded the U.S. credit rating because we have not addressed the primary drivers of our debts and deficits.

It's nearly 2 years later, and neither the President nor congressional Democrats have offered a serious plan that would address the problems that caused the downgrade in the first place. This legislation places that responsibility on the Obama administration and encourages the President to be more involved with taming our debt, something Republicans have long called for.

Some critics of this legislation have claimed that it opens the door for Treasury to issue new debt for new spending or that it is simply raising the debt limit by another means. This is categorically false. This bill does not increase the debt limit. Instead, under this legislation, Treasury loses the authority to issue debt above the limit if doing so creates any room under the existing old debt limit.

Treasury may not issue new debt above the statutory limit again until the limit is reached. Additionally, any new debt issued to pay principal and interest is not exempt from the statutory limit unless issuing the new debt would cause Treasury to exceed the statutory limit.

The American people agree, and that support transcends party lines. A majority, 55 percent, support requiring the government to pay the principal and interest on the debt before it pays for other government expenses. Support for the proposal is strong among Republicans, 65 percent; Independents, 53 percent; while Democrat voters are split evenly between favor, 46, and opposed, 47.

Clearly, we cannot default on our debt. The consequences of doing so could be very serious. A default would at the very least hinder an already stagnant economic recovery, and, in a worst-case scenario, lead the country back into a recession.

□ 0930

Failure to make a debt payment will increase our borrowing costs and threaten our ability to make any of the other payments we owe. If signed into law, this legislation would prevent such an unacceptable situation.

The President and Congress must work to reduce the growing burden of our debt and deficits, but we must do so without imposing more tax increases on hardworking families and

job creators. There are bipartisan policies we can enact to reduce wasteful Washington spending and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations.

The Ways and Means Committee has already begun to examine those policies and will continue to do so over the coming months. In the meantime, we must act to make it clear to the American people and the world economy that the U.S. will not default on a debt payment. The legislation before us accomplishes that important goal, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wanted to state the facts here so everybody understands them. We have called this—as the Speaker has, in essence—Paying China First, and so many others, except for Social Security beneficiaries, come last, come next, if at all. And here's the reason: of the prioritized debt covered by this bill, 47 percent is foreign owned, and China bondholders are the largest ones of that foreign ownership.

So, essentially, what this bill says is, okay, let's pay China and the other foreign bondholders first, not American troops, not disabled veterans, not physicians, providers who treat Medicare patients, not small businesses holding contract obligations from the United States, school lunch programs secondary, medical research, Pell grants, taxpayers due refunds, and, interestingly, other Federal trust funds holding Treasury bonds, Medicare, deposit insurance, et cetera, et cetera. That's the fact. That's the fact.

So why do this? Well, it is said let's do this because of the importance of paying the bonds in terms of our economy and in terms of our bond rating.

Let me just say a word about bond rating. Here's what Fitch has said:

It is not assured that the Treasury would or legally could prioritize debt service over its myriad of other obligations, including social security payments, tax rebates, and payments to contractors and employees. Arrears on such obligations would not constitute a default event from a sovereign rating perspective, but very likely prompt a downgrade even as debt obligations continued to be met.

It was interesting that S&P, who already downgraded us, said this:

Still, sudden cuts that shave off, say, 6 percent of the GDP-to-spending ratio would cause economic panic and could affect ratings.

So, why is this being done when a former Bush administration economist said the result is “a bloody mess,” or another Bush administration official said “prioritization is impossible.” Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, and rent contract payments in order to pay off Treasury bondholders?

So why is this being done? It's not going anywhere in the Senate. The President opposes it. I think the reason, apparently, it's being done is to

satisfy some within the Republican caucus or maybe to try to provide some leverage in terms of bargaining with the Democrats.

This is playing with fire, though, with the economy of this country. Those who vote for playing with this fire are going to burn themselves. But I think most significantly, they're going to burn the economy of the United States of America.

I've tried to figure out who the Pied Piper is of this proposition. It's hard to figure it out. But those who followed that Pied Piper in the Republican ranks, those who vote for it essentially are moving towards the cliff following that Pied Piper; but, worse off, it places this country once again and its economy in danger of going over the cliff. This is not only a mistaken idea, it's really a rotten one. Let's vote “no.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Since the gentleman raised the question of who holds our debt, this chart shows that the vast majority of our debt is held by Americans. That's a fact. Thirty percent of the debt is held by citizens, pension funds, and you go down the list. Two-thirds of our debt is held by Americans. We need to make sure that Americans are paid first.

With that, I would yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, as I meet with my constituents back home, they tell me loud and clear their concerns about our record debt and deficits. We are nearly \$17 trillion in debt. That comes out to about \$53,000 per person.

My constituents back home get it. They've had to make tough choices to live within their means and they expect Washington to do the same.

My Republican colleagues and I have been committed to getting our fiscal house in order, growing our economy, and getting America back to work. In fact, we passed a budget that balances in 10 years. On the other hand, the President's and the Senate Democrats' budgets never balance—ever.

Hardworking taxpayers and their children and grandchildren deserve better. We need to leave them a stronger and more secure America, not a mountain of debt.

Madam Speaker, the bill we are considering today, the Full Faith and Credit Act, would require Treasury to make good on debt payments. The bill also enables Treasury to pay Social Security benefits to seniors, survivors, and those with disabilities and their families. Madam Speaker, let me say that again. Under this bill, seniors will get their checks, and those on disability will get their checks.

Back in 1996, we passed similar legislation to H.R. 807. Then Social Security was getting more in revenues than it was paying out in benefits, so full

Social Security benefits could be paid without hitting the debt limit.

Today, there aren't enough revenues to pay Social Security benefits. To make up the difference, Treasury has to redeem the debt it owes Social Security by borrowing from the public. This may cause a small increase in the debt, because when Treasury redeems Social Security IOUs, it must pay any interest accrued on that debt. Our bill exempts this interest from counting against the debt limit.

Madam Speaker, according to CBO, Social Security's cash shortfall is projected to reach \$77 billion this year. Over 10 years, Social Security's shortfall will total \$1.3 trillion. These cash shortfalls are permanent and are growing each and every year.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we owe it to the American people. In fact, we must come together to preserve and protect Social Security.

□ 0940

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the ranking member.

I rise partly in sadness, wholly in disappointment, that we are playing this game. How sad. I tell my other friend from Michigan, his amendment is sad, too, I want to say. It's a device to try to get people to vote for a bill that has no merit by making Members' pay somehow present in this bill. We ought to consider things on their merit, not on this political gamesmanship.

Madam Speaker, for the second time, House Republicans have decided to put our country at risk by defaulting on its obligations. They know this bill is not going anywhere. They know the President would veto it, and they know Republican economists think this bill makes no sense. I won't ask the gentleman who chairs the Ways and Means Committee his real view on this bill.

This so-called "debt prioritization" bill mandates that, in the event we hit the debt limit, we will pay China first, not our contractors doing business with us, not our Federal employees, not veterans—yes, Social Security is taken care of—not our military. We'll pay China first. That's what this bill says. No major creditor in this country would have a debt prioritization. Now, the secondary lenders and tertiary lenders, yes, have prioritization, but no major lender, no big corporation. They say, if we incur a debt, we'll pay it—not we'll pay this one first and you second or third or fourth. We'll pay China first and other creditors before we pay our troops, seniors, health care and veterans benefits. Yes, you've made an exemption for Social Security, not in the original bill, but politically that was too hot to handle, so you added Social Security.

Just yesterday, Speaker BOEHNER admitted that this bill means the United States of America will voluntarily act

like a bankrupt corporation and pay China before we pay our troops. How sad. How patently political. How transparent that we are trying to give a fig leaf so that we can play around with the national debt. Ronald Reagan would be deeply disappointed, and he expressed that.

Speaker BOEHNER said:

Those who have loaned us money, like in any other proceeding . . . the bondholders usually get paid first. The same thing here—pay China first.

This partisan bill is not a feasible solution to our debt problem, and even Republicans recognize this won't work.

Tony Fratto, a former Bush administration spokesman on economic policy—this is a Republican spokesman—said:

Prioritization is impossible. Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, rent, contract payments, et cetera, in order to pay off Treasury bondholders? That would be a political catastrophe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Former Bush chief economic adviser Keith Hennessey—this is an economic adviser, not a spokesperson—said this:

If the U.S. Government legally commits to paying someone a benefit or agrees to pay a firm for a good or a service, the U.S. Government should fulfill that agreement in a timely fashion. To do otherwise is taking the first step to becoming a banana republic.

That's Hennessey, not HOYER, not a Democrat. That's a Bush economic adviser.

Madam Speaker, we should not be admitting defeat and ranking the losers as this bill would do. Instead of choosing to pay China or any other holder of our debt before we pay our troops—and we ought to pay them, and we ought to pay them on time, but that's not the issue. The issue is the United States of America, the most creditworthy Nation on Earth, ought to pay all its debt in a timely fashion—all—not prioritize—all—across the board. For our wounded veterans and for the seniors who have worked hard to build this country, we should be working to fix the problem by coming to a consensus on a big and balanced deal to reduce our deficit, including tax reform, which the chairman is so assiduously seeking.

Playing politically motivated games with the creditworthiness of the United States will only risk another downgrade.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Full Faith and Credit Act.

Now, much has been said about how ridiculous it is that we find ourselves going through this debt limit routine

so darned often, but this limit exists in order to induce this body to reflect on the folly of our mindless borrow-and-spend practices. Such reflection ought to lead us to serious debate and even to cooperation. It presents an opportunity for public servants to engage in thoughtful, respectful dialogue and to craft long-term solutions.

As we approach the limit for the third time in my 2½ years here, we have an opportunity to work together and finally make our largest programs of government sustainable. We have an opportunity to work together and finally tackle long-neglected issues like tax reform so that jobs and personal incomes can grow more quickly.

The Full Faith and Credit Act protects and advances such opportunities for Congress to accomplish big things, and it does this simply by removing the specter of default from the table altogether. No one is contemplating default over our Nation's obligations. America will always and forever pay its bills, and the Full Faith and Credit Act makes this crystal clear—by making default impossible.

Our support for this act simply cannot and should not be regarded as ideological or partisan, so I respectfully call on every one of my good colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to support this commonsense bill, to take default off the table, and to put the focus squarely on dealing with our real challenges. Let's harness this opportunity of an approaching borrowing limit to come together as problem solvers.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 10 seconds.

Now, this bill not only contemplates default—it plans for it. Default is default is default.

I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished former chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. I heard the last speaker, but there is no question in my mind that when a person from the other side said that the Republican Party's first priority is not the salvation of our country but to stop Barack Obama, I didn't take him too seriously after the election; but I see the campaign continues. As a political veteran, I understand that; but let me make it clear what we are doing today.

I had a friend who was deeply in debt. He owed so much money that he just knew he couldn't pay all of his creditors. Now, it was nowhere near \$14 trillion, but it was a lot. The creditors harassed him day in and day out, telling him he had to make these payments. Finally, he got annoyed, he got angry, and he called his creditors and told them, If you keep harassing me, I will not put your name in the hat, because every month I put all of my creditors' bills into a hat; but the way you are treating me—calling the job, harassing me at home—your name will not go into the hat.

Now, that's pretty poor policy, I would think, but if I understand this correctly, we are telling our creditors that certain names will be in that hat and that other people will not be in that hat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RANGEL. So what names go into the hat?

Communist China goes into the hat. Iran and Venezuela go into the hat. Saudi Arabia goes into the hat. Russia goes into the hat.

Who's outside the hat?

Disabled veterans are out of the hat, and health providers are out of the hat. A lot of people who deserve to be considered as creditors to protect full faith and credit are out of the hat.

This is bad for my friend—it's worse for our country—and this is not the way those people to whom we owe money should be treated. America is greater than that.

□ 0950

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and commend Chairman CAMP and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

The Full Faith and Credit Act authorizes the Treasury Secretary to make only the principal and interest payments on our national debt if the United States reaches its current national debt limit of more than \$16.4 trillion. The legislation also holds harmless Social Security benefits and requires a weekly report from the Treasury Department regarding the interest and principles payments it has made due to our ever-growing national debt.

As almost everyone knows, our national debt is more than \$16.4 trillion, a number that is mind boggling and almost unimaginable. Our Federal Government has grown so large that trying to save a nickel for every dollar we spend is difficult.

To put \$16.4 trillion in perspective, this equates to more than \$111,500 in debt per taxpayer. If you stacked \$16.4 trillion in one dollar bills, it would stack to the moon 4 times.

If we fail to get our spending under control, it will not just be our children and grandchildren who will suffer but everyone hoping to retire in five to ten years as well. If we continue on this path, we will soon be printing so much money that pensions will be worth very little.

In fact, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office released a report on February 5th of this year projecting the United States will be making a total of more than \$224 billion in interest payments on our national debt. By 2023 it is estimated we will be making \$857 billion in interest payments on our national debt, almost quadrupling our yearly interest payment.

This legislation is a thoughtful, creative way to not dig ourselves further into this hole. We

cannot continue our reckless spending ways and expect our creditors to continue funding a Nation that borrows money just to make its own interest payments.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I had hoped that amidst all the controversies that grip Congress, certainly we should at least be able to agree that the full faith and credit of the United States should not hang in the balance every time there's a fiscal controversy in Washington. I also want to thank Chairman CAMP and his Ways and Means Committee for revisions that make this solution much simpler and more practical than the original draft.

Madam Speaker, this bill simply guarantees that the sovereign debt of the United States Government will be paid in full and on time under any circumstances.

Most States have had similar provisions to guarantee their debt in their laws or constitutions for generations. Last year, in testimony to the Senate, Ben Bernanke praised these State provisions for maintaining confidence in their bonds. He told our House Budget Committee that a similar measure at the Federal level would help to protect us against a sovereign default, which he called a "very high priority."

And yet, this President and his followers in Congress, who have taken our Nation on the biggest borrowing binge in its history—who've run up more debt than almost all of his predecessors put together—oppose this commonsense measure to strengthen the credit upon which that debt depends.

This bill tells credit markets that even in the event of an impasse on the debt limit, their loans to this government are absolutely safe.

The Democrats have raised three arguments in opposition. First, the whip just said that guaranteeing the Nation's sovereign debt is just an excuse for not paying our other bills. What utter nonsense. I challenge him to name one Member of Congress who has ever suggested that this measure is an acceptable substitute for not paying our other bills. Do they actually suggest that all these other States that have guaranteed their sovereign debts for generations have ever used these guarantees as an excuse not to pay their other bills?

On the contrary, by providing clear and unambiguous mandates to protect their credit first, they actually support and maintain their ability to pay for all of their other obligations.

The second argument that we have heard ad nauseam is that this bill will pay China before it pays our troops. Well, I would remind them, as the chairman said, that more than half of our debt is actually held by Americans, often by American pension funds. China holds just 11 percent. So this measure actually protects Americans far more than the Chinese.

But whether our loans come from China or from grandma's pension fund, without the Nation's credit, we cannot pay our troops or any of our other obligations.

We are borrowing a quarter of every dollar that we spend, and under this administration we have amassed a debt that is now larger than our Nation's entire economy. Our Nation's credit now carries a greater strain and burden than it ever has before. This measure strengthens our credit by guaranteeing that our sovereign debt will be paid in full and on time.

Perhaps the most bizarre argument that we've heard is that by guaranteeing the Nation's credit, we actually undermine it and risk another downgrade in our credit rating. After all, as the ranking member said, a downgrade followed the last debt debate in Congress.

Here are the facts: Standard & Poor's officials had warned for months that Congress had to reduce the projected 10-year deficit by \$4 trillion in order to maintain its AAA credit rating. Because of Democratic intransigence, this Congress could only reduce it by \$1.2 trillion. So we lost the rating. Facts are indeed stubborn things.

But the opponents are correct in one point—that several officials did express a concern that the impasse could have caused a default in the Nation's sovereign debt. That is precisely what this measure would protect us from in the future.

No one advocates that the government delay paying any of our bills, and this legislation does no such thing. Indeed, this legislation protects our ability to pay all of our other bills because paying those bills depends on maintaining the Nation's credit.

Given the precarious state of our Nation's finances, principled disputes over how the debt limit is addressed are going to happen from time to time. Just a few years ago, then-Senator Barack Obama vigorously opposed an increase in the debt limit that was sought by the Bush administration.

When these controversies erupt, as they inevitably do in a free society, it is imperative that credit markets are supremely confident that their loans to the United States are secure. That's what this bill does.

For once, let us set aside all this partisan posturing and act in the Nation's interest.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want the record to be clear: of the public debt prioritized by this bill, foreign holders own 47 percent and China holds 22 percent of that.

I now yield 1½ minutes to another distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. McDERMOTT.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, we haven't done anything in this House all week, and here we are working on a



plan on how the government can default on its debts. That's what this is really all about.

It reminds me of the derivation of the word "bedlam."

Bedlam was a large mental hospital in the middle of London. It was really called "Bethlehem," but people locally called it "Bedlam." This is a policy that came out of bedlam and will create bedlam.

If we don't pay our debts, we are going to create problems in our own country, as well as in the world economic system.

If you want to lose the United States dollar as the currency that is used by the world, start by not paying your debts. Everybody will say, Why do we want a dollar? Those folks don't pay. That's what you're creating—bedlam—here today.

I urge everyone to vote "no."

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, from the very origins of this country, the very beginnings, this country has always made good on its sovereign debt.

Let me be clear what this bill does. It ensures that the United States shall never default on its sovereign debt.

What does it not do? It's not a solution to the debt problem. We have a serious long-term liability problem in this country and a failure by our colleagues on the other side to recognize that we have to deal with this. Simply raising taxes ad nauseam is not a solution. We need to come to a real solution so that seniors are not left behind on their Medicare benefits and Social Security is taken care of.

What does it not do? It's not a pay China first bill. China's holdings are less than 8 percent, and the ranking member's figures were wrong because he failed to account for the Social Security trust fund in that calculation. What we have used are the accurate figures from the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

What does it not do? It does not authorize new spending and new debt. This bill just simply says the United States shall always make good on its sovereign debt. It doesn't provide a solution to the long-term problem. We've got to solve those problems. We need to come together and come up with solutions for the longer-term liability with Medicare and all the other spending programs that are bankrupting this country.

It's been said that the national debt of the United States is a threat to our national security in the long run. We need real long-term solutions and not demagoguery and not disingenuous arguments.

The language is very clear. We have seen what the language is in these credit rating agencies as they did this downgrade. It was basically a failure of Congress to come together and work

with the administration to come up with a real long-term plan. That is the issue.

The United States will not default on its debt, and this provides an extra tool for Treasury.

□ 1000

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), another very distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. LEVIN, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pay China First Act. We are the United States of America, and we pay our bills. Madam Speaker, I cannot believe that this body would even entertain or consider a bill that puts the Social Security check of 56 million seniors and people after China. How can we justify putting 2 million American military personnel, many of whom are in harm's way, after China? That is not right. That is not fair. As a Congress, we can do better, much better.

Let me be crystal clear. Default is not an option. The United States of America pays all of its bills as they come due. This is the American way.

Let's stop playing games and do what is right; do what is just; do what is fair. Let's do what every American citizen has to do, pay our debts. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote "no" on the Pay China First Act. We have a moral obligation to do what is right.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), a distinguish member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I think it is important to say first and foremost that no matter how passionate you are, no matter how loud you scream, it doesn't convert nonsense to facts. The point is China's debt holdings are less than 8 percent. It makes for a great talking point. I understand that.

Madam Speaker, nobody wants to hit the debt ceiling. In fact, no one wants to get anywhere near it. On the contrary, we are the ones that are trying to get Washington's spending under control so it will live within its means. That's why we talk about budgets and spending and living within our means, because House Republicans fight that fight. If we weren't doing it, we wouldn't even know that there are limits to our spending. The House budget does just that, balancing the Federal budget in 10 years.

We understand that we must take precautions to protect the creditworthiness of the United States. We can hope for the best, but we must prepare for the worst. And the worst that can happen with the debt ceiling is a government default. The bill before us today takes default off the table, period. No more, no less.

We've been told by the credit-rating agencies that the greatest factor affecting our national credit rating is the government's ability to pay its debt-holders. This bill makes sure that it will. This bill requires—not allows—requires Treasury to continue to pay principal and interest on existing debt if, and only if, we hit the debt ceiling before a deal is reached. This is a backstop that takes default off the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. With it we can focus on the other issues of debt and spending that created the problem in the first place. We can have an honest debate about what is driving government debt and how to deal with it. I hope we don't get anywhere near the debt ceiling limit. I hope we use the next few months to negotiate and reach an agreement that avoids any risk of hitting the debt ceiling; but until then, we should agree that it's our duty to protect America's credit rating.

I look forward to voting for this measure, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), another very distinguished member of our committee.

(Mr. NEAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to the Republican proposal today to pay China first.

Now, I think that there is another way that we might describe this legislation from our Republican friends, and it would go like this: let's balance the budget when Bill Clinton is President, and let's balance the budget when Barack Obama is President. But in the intervening 8 years, let's go on a reckless spending spree and cut taxes by \$2.3 trillion, engage two wars internationally, embrace a prescription drug bill, spend the country into oblivion, and cut taxes for the wealthiest people.

Recall: balance the budget when Bill Clinton is President, and balance the budget when Barack Obama is President. Worry about the debt not when George Bush is President, but only when you have Democratic Presidents.

This is a reckless proposal today, and everybody knows it.

Speaker BOEHNER is quoted in one of the dailies this morning as saying of course we pay the bondholders first. That's a fact. The previous speaker didn't mention that. He said, let's deal with the facts. So who are the bondholders? They emphasize, they suggest that it's the American people. Foreign debt is held by the Chinese and the Japanese second, and everybody knows it.

So it's austerity for the American people, but make sure that the bondholders are paid. It's cut back on everything for the American people, but

make sure the bondholders are paid. Cut taxes by \$2.3 trillion, and not to worry about the austerity of the American people.

Recall: balance the budget when Bill Clinton is President; balance the budget when Barack Obama is President.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and for bringing this bill forward, Congressman MCCLINTOCK's Full Faith and Credit Act. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of the bill because what the bill does is clearly take default off the table as an option when we're having negotiations over the debt ceiling.

Now, people would say why is this even an issue. Unfortunately, it's an issue because the only people in town who have been threatening default are President Obama and liberals in Congress. And you've heard some of the speakers against this bill today talking about the threat of default. What's so good about this bill is it takes default off the table. It takes away their ability to default on our Nation's debt.

In fact, President Obama in the last debt ceiling negotiation almost 2 years ago was the one running around the country threatening to default on our credit, so much so that it scared the markets and hurt our economy. And, in fact, it is one of the things that led to a downgrade, the first time in our Nation's history that our credit rating was downgraded because the problem that gets us to the debt ceiling is that Washington has a spending problem. It's spending that continues to force us to hit the debt ceiling.

And so when we're negotiating on the debt ceiling, we shouldn't be worried about the President running around threatening default; we should be focused on fixing the spending problem. Americans sent us here to tackle the tough issues, not to be clouded and confused by the President's threats of default. Unfortunately, the GAO has even said the President can prioritize. He should. It would be responsible to pay your debts, but the President himself has said he would consider defaulting if we hit the debt ceiling.

And so what this bill says is you pay Americans first. As the chairman of Ways and Means pointed out, it is American citizens who own the bulk of our debt. They would be paid. Social Security would be paid. But then we could focus on the spending problem, and the negotiations on debt ceiling would be about solving the spending problem in Washington that continues to force us to hit the debt ceiling so that we can stop living from crisis to crisis and finally get our economy moving again. I urge passage.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman. I rise today to oppose

the Pay China First Act, and I do this with a heavy heart because I know the number of talented individuals that we have on this committee and the process that we've been through where we're working together. It astounds me that somehow the ideological tail of the Tea Party wags the whole Republican effort in this area, and the ideological reach of the Tea Party exceeds the certainty that we should be bringing to the American people.

□ 1010

Instead, we're playing hostage politics again, holding up the American people, creating all the uncertainty that we don't need in this kind of climate instead of demonstrating that we can sit down and work together.

I get the politics. I understand how you have to accede to a group that continues to take us to the precipice and then pull back. The American people are through with it.

Let's sit down, deal with this, and then move on; create the certainty that will create the jobs here. Let's not find ourselves in a situation that becomes almost oxymoron, where we're paying China first, at the expense of Americans when there is no good reason why we should be dealing with this issue whatsoever, other than the hostage politics that it creates to deal with an ideological minority that drives the other side.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA I appreciate my colleague from Michigan allowing me to speak here today. My colleague from California, I'm glad to be a cosponsor of this very important measure.

"Full faith and credit," what does that mean? What does it mean to the American people? When we ask for them to send us to Washington, to send us to this august place, we're asking for their faith in what we do with their money, with their tax dollars.

And so when we report back to them, what does that look like to them? Have we upheld their faith? Have we done everything we can in this Nation to keep the credit rating of America on line?

This measure is a giant step towards keeping that faith, to paying our bills on time, to paying the types of things that keep our credit rating in a best possible fashion for our country.

We default on that, we put our whole economic system in peril. We drive up the cost of doing business for our government, and more tax dollars it costs to run our government when we do that.

We hear talk about pay China first. Well, that's kind of funny, because if we wouldn't do that kind of business with China, if we'd pay attention to our own level of spending and growing the economy of this country instead of having to do things that cause debt to go up higher, we wouldn't be having to contract with them for more debt.

So that comes back to this place here, reforming the way we do busi-

ness. We don't need to run up more debt. We don't need to put ourselves in a position where we can't get together on getting the budget done, on getting the debt ceiling adjusted whatever it takes so we don't fall into this default position.

So I think this is a giant step in the right direction. I commend my colleagues for making this happen. And let's uphold the faith that we've asked of the people of this country by paying our bills on time, by paying the debt, the interest that it takes to keep our credit in line as best possible as we can in this country.

So this is a measure that deserves support and puts the priorities first. I ask for support for it.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I rise in opposition to the Pay China First Act. Simply by putting this legislation on the floor, it does real damage in terms of putting questions in the minds of people around the world who to this point have been giving billions of dollars to the United States Government to be able to pay for past spending at record low rates.

I listened to the last speaker opine that we need to do everything to justify the faith in the American people. Well, the reckless threats that we saw 2 years ago, where, for the first time, we really were staring into the face of the abyss and it was a real possibility that they would withhold the votes, deny increase in the debt ceiling and, for the first time in our history, not pay for spending already incurred, in fact, ironically, the Ryan budget would have required a massive increase in the debt ceiling. The American people know this, and no amount of subterfuge here is going to eliminate that doubt, that concern, that apprehension. It may give the illusion of a few more days' breathing room with the debt ceiling.

What we need to do is set this aside and get to business. I would note, with no small amount of irony, that my friends on the other side of the aisle who have been so interested in a budget now refuse to appoint members for a conference committee so that the House and the Senate can come together and do that. That would be a lot more productive than this charade.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I, too, rise in opposition to the Pay China First Act.

Madam Speaker, I, for the life of me, do not understand why we are even seriously considering this legislation which would call for the default on our Nation's financial obligations for the



very first time in our Nation's history, completely jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States of America, jeopardize the economic recovery, which still needs help right now, and it would be the greatest unforced, self-inflicted wound that this body can commit against the U.S. economy in our Nation's history.

But let's be clear. This has very little to do about true fiscal responsibility. This issue, this legislation is being driven by a very narrow bunch on the other side with a radical governing philosophy which basically says, I hate my government so much that I'm willing to jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States and bring this economy down until we get our way. That's what's driving this legislation right now. That's the jeopardy that we face with it.

And I doubt that this has a serious chance of passing. But what the answer to this is is for us to go to conference on the budget resolutions that have now passed the House and Senate and start talking and listening to each other to find the common ground we need to reach a long-term deficit reduction agreement.

But defaulting on some of our obligations will mean putting great doubt in the rest of the investors in the United States in regards to who will be next. And that's what this legislation is promising: a default with some, a payment of China and others at the expense of the U.S. economy.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. I rise, Madam Speaker, in strong opposition to the Pay China First Act. This is a Pyrrhic proposal if I ever saw one.

By the way, the firefighters are in town today and tomorrow, and I'm going to go to every firefighter I see in Washington, D.C., and tell them how foolish—you know, the sponsors of this legislation believe that the Federal Government has no responsibility to firefighters or police officers anyway. It's strictly a local thing. So they're not trying to balance a budget.

If this bill becomes law, the government will still be borrowing money and our deficit will increase. It's what this bill allows us to borrow money for that is so shameful.

Is the government allowed to pay our Active Duty military? No.

Can we add to our deficit to fund veterans' benefits? No.

What about Medicare? Sorry, we're not going to pay those bills.

However, the government is allowed to borrow to pay back foreign bondholders. The majority apparently believes it's okay to borrow money and add to our deficit to pay China, but not to honor the obligations we have to our

troops, our veterans, our seniors, et cetera. Shameful. There is simply no other word.

The United States of America pays its bills, period, end of sentence, case closed. We've done it for 200 years, whether it's obligations that we have to our troops or seniors, we have to those who have bought our bonds.

We all saw what happened in the summer of 2011. We don't need a repeat.

□ 1020

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to another member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pay China First Act. This is a very dangerous debate that we are conducting today because I think it has ramifications beyond simple debate. It calls into question whether or not America will pay its bills. You could also call this bill the Put America Last Act because that's exactly what this bill does. It's a bill that will actually make the Tea Party policies a reality, turning us into a deadbeat nation, a nation that does not pay its bills.

This Republican bill will codify into law a new low for America. It will ensure U.S. taxpayers always pay China and other regimes and foreign banks before our veterans, before our seniors on Medicare, and even before our enlisted troops bravely serving overseas. That's right. We'll pay these folks before we pay these folks. We pay these folks under this bill if it were to become law before we pay these folks. That simply is wrong and unacceptable to the American people.

Even the sponsors of this bill admit that in addition to putting China first and America last, their bill will also increase the deficit. Let me say that again. This bill will also increase the deficit and will pay China first. What the Republican majority is doing with this bill is announcing to the world—everyone from small businesses who sell services to the government to grandmothers buying savings bonds for their grandchildren—that this Congress is not serious about paying our Nation's bill.

My colleagues, please, put Americans first, put our troops first and China last. Do not pass the Pay China First Act.

Mr. CAMP. I would like to include for the RECORD a letter from the Congressional Budget Office that says this bill has no budget impact.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, April 26, 2013

Hon. DAVE CAMP  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Jared Brewster.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE  
(For Douglas W. Elmendorf, Director).  
Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST  
ESTIMATE

H.R. 807—Full Faith and Credit Act

H.R. 807 would allow the Department of the Treasury to issue debt to pay principal and interest on debt held by the public and debt held by the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Disability Insurance Trust Fund, if the statutory limit on debt is reached. The bill would require the Treasury to provide a weekly report to the House Committee on Ways and Means and Senate Committee on Finance outlining the exempted transactions until a new debt limit is enacted.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 807, by itself, would result in no costs or savings to the federal government because it would not change any of the government's tax or spending policies. Therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. In addition, CBO estimates that the bill would not significantly add to the Treasury's administrative costs.

H.R. 807 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jared Brewster. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my real pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member on the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan. I strongly oppose this bill which, as our colleagues have said, says we should pay the government of China before we pay our troops, before we pay our veterans, and before we pay other bills here in the United States.

Of all the bad ideas that have come to the floor of this House, this one is one of the worst. It's a reckless, irresponsible proposal that says the United States of America is not going to pay all the bills that are due and owing. That will have a terrible impact on our creditworthiness, it will undermine the full faith and credit of the United States, and it would wreak havoc in the economy.

Look, Madam Speaker, our constituents don't have the luxury of waking up one morning and saying: Do you know what? I'm only going to make my mortgage payment. I'm not going to make my car payment, and I'm not going to make my credit card payments.

If they did that, what would happen? They would lose their creditworthiness. For the United States of America to say we're going to pay some bills but not all would have hugely damaging impacts on the economy.

And it gets worse, because when they say, We've got to pay some, but not all, you've got to decide whom you're going to pay first. And what they decide here

is they're going to pay China first, and they have to decide who is not a priority. In this bill, our veterans are not a priority, and our troops risking their lives in Afghanistan are not a priority. China is a priority; they're not.

Now, Madam Speaker, what will happen here is that people will lose faith in whether or not the country pays its bills. People need to understand very clearly that this is not about expanding the debt ceiling in order to take on new obligations. This is about paying our existing obligations. And if we announce to the world that we're planning on not paying our obligations, whether they're to bondholders or to our troops, guess what happens? People will lose faith in the United States Government, and the economy will get hit hard.

Let's vote against this bill that says China comes before our troops and our veterans.

Mr. CAMP. In August of 2010, Chairman Admiral Mullen said that the most significant threat to our national security was our debt. And since that time, we have added hundreds of billions of dollars to our national debt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to a distinguished Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, ALLYSON SCHWARTZ.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I rise in strong opposition to this Republican pay China first bill, which would jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States. This legislation dictates which of our Nation's bills we will pay and which we will not, and poses a serious, dangerous threat to our economy. The Republicans put foreign creditors ahead of our veterans, Active Duty military, Medicare recipients, and small businesses.

The Republicans' refusal to pay our Nation's bills inflicts another round of unnecessary wounds that weakened our economy in 2011. American families, American workers, and American small businesses have battled economic uncertainty for far too long, and this deeply irresponsible legislation will only exacerbate the challenges we face.

Instead of moving us closer to common ground on a balanced, responsible path for economic growth, Republicans' brinkmanship threatens to undermine consumer and investor confidence and slows economic growth.

I urge opposition to this legislation and instead that we do what we have always done as Americans: pay our bills, pay them on time, pay them in full and protect America's economy and our financial standing in the global economy.

Mr. LEVIN. Can I ask our distinguished Speaker how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. I have no further speakers.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pay China First Act. Once again, the Republican majority has chosen to play politics with the credit of our Nation. Instead of coming to the table with solutions, they are ensuring that we will come to a default on our Nation's debt.

This bill accomplishes one simple goal: pay China first. If the Republicans cause a default on our debt, H.R. 807 would guarantee that bondholders in China and other foreign nations will get paid before our men and women in uniform. Honorable veterans and the doctors and the hospitals that take care of our senior citizens on Medicare will all lose out. Are these truly the right priorities for our country, Madam Speaker?

Democrats are focused on job recovery, job growth, and securing a future for our hardworking taxpayers and the middle class. We are ready to act now on commonsense budget proposals that are balanced and fair. I ask the majority now to stop playing political games and let's work together on commonsense solutions to strengthen our country.

Mr. LEVIN. So, Mr. CAMP, are you ready to close this part of our debate? How much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I just want to read the facts why this bill essentially says "China first." I want everybody to understand this isn't rhetoric; this is reality.

The Republicans, under this bill, prioritize \$14.3 trillion in debt, of that, \$2.7 trillion in Social Security and \$11.6 trillion in public debt. Of that public debt, \$5.6 trillion is foreign. So when you come up and talk about all of the American public, you are not talking about what is in this bill. And of that foreign debt, the largest creditor is China, with over \$1 trillion.

□ 1030

So it's absolutely true that essentially what you're saying is pay the largest of the foreign creditors instead of American troops, veterans, physicians, school lunch programs, universities doing medical research, taxpayers getting refunds, and other Federal trust funds holding Treasury bonds, Medicare—these are Americans—deposited insurance, highway trust funds, et cetera, et cetera. That's the fact.

Now, there's some effort here to say, oh, we're not defaulting. Yes, you are. You're not defaulting on sovereign debt, but you're defaulting, except for Social Security, on everything else. Republicans are becoming lead defaulters in terms of paying our debt.

As I said earlier, the credit agencies have said, and I'll close with this:

It is not assured that the Treasury would or legally could prioritize debt service over

its myriad of other obligations . . . but very likely prompt downgrade, even as our debt obligations continued to be met.

This is a drastic, serious mistake. Vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think it's helpful in a debate like this to start with the facts. And I would just say it's illustrative of just how out of touch and irresponsible the other side is when they assert that our debt is \$14 trillion. Our debt is over \$16 trillion. They've just lost \$2 trillion? No wonder they don't think this is an urgent problem. They don't even know what our debt is.

This legislation is very similar to 1996, legislation that was passed in a bipartisan vote and was signed by then-Democrat President Bill Clinton.

Many States guarantee their government debt, or what is often called their sovereign debt, and they have done that for decades. If we default on our government or sovereign debt, the consequences are so severe that no one gets paid—our military, our seniors, our veterans, our farmers. All Americans deserve a strong economy, and that means getting our debt under control.

And let's just clear up another fact. The top two-thirds of our debt is held by Americans and their retirement funds, including the U.S. military retirement fund.

Now, one reason we're in this position is that this administration has racked up more than \$5 trillion in debt, more than the previous four Presidents added together. That's why we're in this situation. We have a debt problem. This legislation ensures that the debt of the United States will be paid.

So I urge support for H.R. 807, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, after line 17, insert the following (and redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly):

(c) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—None of the obligations issued under subsection (a) may be used to pay compensation for Members of Congress.

Page 7, line 2, insert "the authority is in use" after "week".

Page 7, strike line 13 and all that follows through line 17.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 202, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act, permanently takes default off the table, as we've been debating, but this amendment makes a couple of simple

changes. It clarifies that any debt issued pursuant to this bill may not be used to pay salaries of Members of Congress—of the House and of the Senate.

It also makes clear that each and every time the Secretary of the Treasury uses the authority provided in the bill, that the Secretary must report weekly on the amount of debt issued and the reason for the issuance to ensure transparency so that Congress is fully informed.

So I urge support for my straightforward amendment and support for the underlying bill and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I'm just going to speak for a short time and then yield.

I respect the chairman of the committee; we've been friends for a long time. It's really sad this amendment is here. There can't be money used under the bill for salaries. There's no lack of clarity here. Essentially, this is an effort to give some kind of fig leaf, or whatever it is, for a terrible, terrible bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have already spoken about this amendment. I think this amendment is as sad as the bill.

We continue to play games because we think that, in a way, we will compel people to vote for something they don't want to vote for—and, in my view, are not going to vote for. I think it's sad. I think we continue to demagogue this institution and its Members. That's sad. We leaders should not do that. This is a serious bill.

Now, I want to tell the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I know what the debt is. And I know that debt has been incurred because we bought a lot of things we didn't pay for, including over \$1 trillion of Afghanistan and Iraq, including a prescription drug bill that projects over \$2 trillion, including tax cuts that were \$2.3 trillion that not a penny were paid for. I understand, and I think it's serious.

The sad thing is that this is not a serious response. This is an irresponsible response. This is a response that, as I said earlier, says that we will pay some people first, but we won't pay all our debts. The richest country on the face of the Earth, the most creditworthy nation on the face of the Earth, we won't pay all our debts.

There is a simple way to do this: stop demagoguing one another. And I want to say to the gentleman, as he knows, Democrats have demagogued this issue when we've had Republican Presidents

and Republicans have demagogued it when we've had Democratic Presidents.

We all know that we've incurred debts and we're going to pay them. That's all this is. It's very simple: we're either going to pay our debts or we're not.

Now, I want to tell my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, I know about the debt. The gentleman refers to \$5 trillion. I'm sure the gentleman knows these statistics:

Under Ronald Reagan, the debt was increased 189 percent; under George Bush, 55 percent—the first George Bush, 55 percent; under this President so far, a little over 40 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Every Republican President with whom I've served, Madam Speaker, every Republican President has increased the debt as a percentage of GDP higher than either Bill Clinton or Barack Obama. Bill Clinton was the lowest, 37 percent. This President is a little over 40 percent of GDP. It's just like saying the minimum wage now is \$7.25, which is so much higher than it was in 1970—which is not the case. Now, as a dollar, a nominal figure, it's higher, and the gentleman knows that very well. He is my friend and I have great respect for him. But this bill is unfortunate. This amendment is—I won't characterize it as harshly as I feel about it.

We have to stop playing games. We have to be serious. We need to come together and adopt a big plan that's balanced, that can pass and will put this country on a fiscally sustainable path; and, in the process, we ought to pay our bills because we incurred them. We incurred them honestly for objectives that this House, this Senate, and the President of the United States signed for.

□ 1040

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield that minute and a half to the vice chair of our caucus, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. I have reservations about the constitutionality of this amendment. What I will say is I would gladly give my pay if it meant that these guys don't get paid. I will give my salaries to the defenders of this country, the men and women who are the front line, if their pay was in question. If all the money in the Congress in our pay could do that, I would gladly do that.

But I say we should definitely pay these guys before we pay these guys. That's what your bill does. The overriding bill would have these guys get paid before these guys. Forget about us guys.

This amendment is a farce. It's to divert attention from the fact that you want to pay these guys before you pay these guys. At the end of the day, that's what the overriding bill is about—putting China first, paying China first, putting our troops last, putting the American people last. It's about putting them first and us last.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I will use it by saying, a default is a default is a default. This bill is a serious mistake, as is the amendment. People can do what they want on the amendment. Vote "no" on the basic bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just wanted to say I also have great respect for the gentleman from Maryland who spoke a couple of speakers ago, who is the distinguished minority whip. We have worked closely together on other issues as well.

I would just say that this legislation is very similar to legislation that was passed in a bipartisan way in 1996 and signed by then-President Bill Clinton. So, this is not something that is brand-new in terms of an approach for this Congress to take when dealing and struggling with debt and our debt issues.

I think it is also important to remember as we go through this debate that now our debt is larger than our entire economy and that the debt that has been incurred under this administration is larger than the debt of the previous four Presidents. We have a path that is unsustainable that has gotten worse, and this has gone on for far too long.

I think it is important, though, that we make these clarifying points in this amount. Clearly, we've heard a lot about demagoguery about who gets paid first. The vast majority of our debt is held by Americans. Americans and the U.S. military retirees will be paid first under this bill; and their retirement funds, their pensions, their savings, that's very important.

This is about making sure that the debt of the United States—that the United States has incurred, not the ongoing payments, but the debt of the United States—is paid. That takes default off the table. That allows us then to move forward to get the larger bipartisan solutions on this growing and difficult problem with our debt that we need to address.

The amendment makes it clear that Members of Congress' salaries won't be paid, that any debt issued will not pay that. It also makes clear that the Secretary of the Treasury must report weekly on the amount of debt. We need transparency. We often don't get the latest information. We need that, both House and Senate. So, this is a straightforward amendment. It's clarifying.

I urge support for the amendment, I urge support for the underlying bill,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to speak on H.R. 807, which would result in the Congress refusing to pay obligations it has already agreed to. American families do not get to choose which bills to pay and which ones not to pay, and the United States Congress cannot either without putting the Nation into default for the first time in its history.

I oppose this bill because not only will it be bad for America, but devastating for Houston. Just as our nation's economy has begun to show signs of sustained improvement, along comes H.R. 807 to further depress the economy of the parts of Houston which have not been fortunate enough to benefit from the economic recovery. The city of Houston has a half-trillion dollar economy which is threatened if the United States economy begins to falter because of the sequester already in place, and misguided legislation like this bill.

This bill would threaten the full faith and credit of the United States, cost American jobs, hurt businesses of all sizes, and do irreparable damage to the economy. It is important to note that the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed above 15,000 for the first time ever, and jobless claims fell to a five-year low this week.

Why would we want to jeopardize this progress with a bill like H.R. 807, which is a step in the wrong direction.

This legislation would cause the Nation to default on payments for Medicare, veterans, national security, and many other critical priorities. This legislation is unwise, unworkable, and unacceptably risky. Earlier this year, the Congress took a sensible approach to paying the bills it had already incurred by raising the debt limit. By contrast, the proposal in H.R. 807, which chooses which bills to pay, is a deeply irresponsible approach that is simply default by another name.

Americans want a clean debt limit increase, which has been done numerous times but the normal process by which the Treasury Secretary consults with the President and Congress, seems to have hit a major roadblock. This obstructionist governing is based on a practice that seems to put ideology over pragmatism and politics over common-sense legislating.

Madam Speaker, another reason I cannot support H.R. 807 is because it gives preference to making payments to foreign bond holders such as China, Iran, and the Cayman Islands over the payments needed for critical services for our veterans, and those payments required under Chapter 31, United States Code, which insures the savings of Americans.

I would hope that my colleagues on the other side realize that these are trying times for the American people and brinkmanship is not the answer. This body must come up with a sensible solution to the pressing financial problems which plague our economy. We cannot continue to hold our Nation hostage, keeping the benefits of recipients of Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare who must have sleepless nights because they are worried about the disappearance of their monthly checks.

I support a long-term increase in the debt limit that would increase certainty and economic stability. The bill before us this morning,

H.R. 807, is a short-term measure with unnecessary complications, needlessly perpetuating uncertainty in the Nation's fiscal system, and I would note that the Obama Administration is also in opposition to this woeful piece of legislation that allows China to be paid first.

My colleagues want to buy time so that they can figure out how to squeeze the American taxpayer even more by devising bone-crunching cuts and slashes to entitlement programs—all of which is driven by rabid ideology—as opposed to sitting down and working with Democrats to come up with reasonable budget reforms which do not hurt Seniors and the disadvantaged.

Madam Speaker, Social Security is currently the only source of income for nearly two-thirds of older American households receiving benefits, and roughly one-third of those households depend on Social Security for nearly all of their income. Half of those 65 and older have annual incomes below \$18,500, and many older Americans have experienced recent and significant losses in retirement savings, pensions, and home values. Today, every dollar of the average Social Security retirement benefit of about \$14,800 is absolutely critical to the typical beneficiary.

Contrary to some claims, Social Security is not the cause of our nation's deficit problem. Not only does the program operate independently, but it is prohibited from borrowing. Social Security must pay all benefits from its own trust fund. If there are insufficient funds to pay out full benefits, benefits are automatically reduced to the level supported by the program's own revenues.

I would add that instead of short-term management of self-inflicted fiscal crises, I truly believe we have an opportunity to strengthen the economy by putting the Nation on a sounder fiscal path. Progress has already been made towards that goal. In 2011, the President signed into law \$1.4 trillion in spending reductions, not counting additional savings from winding down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We need to seize this template and move forward—not backwards, in the direction of H.R. 807.

The fiscal agreement the President signed at the beginning of January increased revenue from high-income households by over \$600 billion. Together with interest savings, these two steps will cut the deficit by more than \$2.5 trillion over the next decade. We should have done more to address our revenue problem.

The President has made clear that he remains willing to work with both parties in the Congress to budget responsibly and to achieve additional deficit reduction consistent with the principles of balance, shared growth, and shared opportunity. By adding Chained CPI to the discussion it is clear that President Obama is willing to go more than halfway to meet the House Majority; but they have not reciprocated.

The President has also made clear that he will not have another debate with the Congress over whether or not they should pay the bills that they have already racked up through the laws that they passed. The President has made clear that the Congress has only two options—pay their bills, or fail to do so and put the Nation into default. And I am in complete agreement.

According to the Bipartisan Policy Center, spending for Medicare and Medicaid is projected to increase from 21 percent of non-in-

terest federal spending in 2010 to 31 percent by 2020. The numbers are workish sounding but in terms of real dollars, the increase is mammoth. That is why we must address the spending issue in earnest but not using the paltry monthly income of Seniors to pay for yachts for millionaires.

National spending on health care has grown about 2 percentage points per year faster than GDP over time. Federal revenues, however, have not kept pace, growing at roughly the same rate as GDP.

As a result, federal deficits will be driven upward by federal health programs unless their rate of growth is tamed. This discrepancy must be dealt with sooner rather than later, but no matter how you couch it, there is no better translation than the word: b-r-o-k-e.

I hasten to add that Community Health Centers provide much needed, high-quality healthcare to over 20 million Americans. These centers are able to serve vulnerable portions of the American population, including racial and ethnic minorities, as well as rural and low-income Americans.

I want to give some pertinent facts about my district and why the uncertainty provided by H.R. 807 is a step in the wrong direction.

The Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown Metropolitan Area consists of 10 counties: Austin, Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Galveston, Harris, Liberty, Montgomery, San Jacinto and Waller.

The Houston metro area:

It ranks sixth among U.S. metropolitan statistical areas with a population of 5,867,489 as of mid-2009, and it covers more than 10,000 square miles, and has a gross product of \$403.8 billion, according to The Perryman Group. This area recorded 2.54 million payroll jobs in November 2010, more than the job counts of 31 U.S. states, including Arizona, Colorado and Alabama.

The Houston economy has experienced a resurgence but let's remember the economic history:

The recession hit Houston in September '08. Our region lost 152,800 jobs through January '10. We began to recoup jobs starting in February that year and by October '11, the region had gained 153,000 jobs, or 101.1 percent of what we lost in the recession.

And though Houston faces some challenges in the near term, the long-term outlook is bright. The challenges are those of managing growth rather than economic stagnation. The long-term outlook for the Houston metro area is positive, and steady growth will be the norm for Houston for the foreseeable future. What Houston cannot afford right now is continued uncertainty from Washington, DC.

Moreover, given the uncertainty of final funding decisions and the possibility that across-the-board spending cuts will drag us back into a recession unless Congress and the President can reach agreement to prevent the currently scheduled "sequester," it is critical that we work towards bipartisan solutions to our nation's financial woes. Given the U.S. economy is showing signs of progress, it is crucial that we continue to fund government programs without interruption.

Lastly, as a Senior Member of the Homeland Security and Judiciary Committees I understand the importance of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection mission to enforce drug, trade and travel laws in efforts to keep our borders safe; and the importance of ensuring

that our nation remains safe from terrorists and others who would do harm to our nation.

In summation, I urge my colleagues to reject this poll-driven exercise in futility and give a clean debt ceiling vote so that the American people can carry-on with the business of achieving prosperity.

Doing a clean debt limit bill is not a new law, new outlay, or some random, esoteric exercise in the fulfillment of the Obama Doctrine. In fact, according to the Congressional Research Service, since March 1962, Congress has enacted 76 separate measures that have altered the limit on federal debt. Typically, the Treasury Secretary consults with the President and Congress, and the limit has been subsequently raised to accommodate our fiscal needs.

And I close with the sacred words from our Constitution. Section 4 of the 14th Amendment states clearly that: "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned." And a great nation pays its debts. That is why I oppose H.R. 807.

I urge my colleagues to resoundingly reject H.R. 807.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, today we find ourselves debating a bill that could result in the United States of America defaulting on our debts. It seems that the Republican majority of the 113th Congress has decided to continue the practice of governing from one manufactured crisis to another.

H.R. 807, the Pay China First Act, is a part of this majority's campaign of playing politics with our national economy at a time when the number one priority of this Congress should be putting Americans back to work.

Madam Speaker, we raise our nation's debt ceiling to pay the bills that our nation has already accrued. The Republican majority's insistence on using the debt ceiling in their crusade against a short-term deficit crisis that doesn't exist, has already harmed our nation's recovery.

This bill, which the Republican majority knows full well has no chance in the Senate, is nothing more than political posturing at its worst. It is nothing more, Madam Speaker, than an attempt by the Republican majority to wash their hands of the calamitous effects their economic policies are having on the American people who want nothing more than their Congress to stop playing politics and get about the work they were elected to do.

Instead, the Republican majority has continued their crusade of irresponsible spending and tax cuts which disproportionately affect those who need it the most.

The number one priority of the 113th Congress should be putting Americans back to work and supporting policies that promote growth.

Madam Speaker, the people of Brooklyn's 9th Congressional district, whom I have the honor of representing in this body, are tired of the 113th Congress undermining the recovery our nation needs. This bill is not worthy of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I submit an article in today's New York Times that, using analysis from leading public and private-sector economists, lays out the harm that the majority's focus on irresponsible spending cuts is having on our struggling economy.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 2013]

#### ECONOMISTS SEE DEFICIT EMPHASIS AS IMPEDING RECOVERY

(By Jackie Calmes and Jonathan Weisman)

WASHINGTON—The nation's unemployment rate would probably be nearly a point lower, roughly 6.5 percent, and economic growth almost two points higher this year if Washington had not cut spending and raised taxes as it has since 2011, according to private-sector and government economists.

After two years in which President Obama and Republicans in Congress have fought to a draw over their clashing approaches to job creation and budget deficits, the consensus about the result is clear: Immediate deficit reduction is a drag on full economic recovery.

Hardly a day goes by when either government analysts or the macroeconomists and financial forecasters who advise investors and businesses do not report on the latest signs of economic growth—in housing, consumer spending, business investment. And then they add that things would be better but for the fiscal policy out of Washington. Tax increases and especially spending cuts, these critics say, take money from an economy that still needs some stimulus now, and is getting it only through the expansionary monetary policy of the Federal Reserve.

"Fiscal tightening is hurting," Ian Shepherdson, chief economist of Pantheon Macroeconomic Advisors, wrote to clients recently. The investment bank Jefferies wrote of "ongoing fiscal mismanagement" in its midyear report on Tuesday, and noted that while the recovery and expansion would be four years old next month, reduced government spending "has detracted from growth in five of past seven quarters."

That period roughly coincides with the time that Mr. Obama and Congressional Republicans have shared governance since Republicans took control of the House in 2011, promising an immediate \$100 billion in spending cuts. Republicans did not get that much then, but the series of budget compromises with the president since—while not so great as they wanted—will soon reduce annual discretionary spending for domestic and military programs to the lowest level in half a century.

As for revenues, Mr. Obama forced Republicans to acquiesce in January to higher taxes from wealthy Americans. But worse, in the macroeconomists' view, both parties agreed not to extend a two-year-old cut in Americans' payroll taxes for Social Security, reducing their spending money.

In all this time, the president has fought unsuccessfully to combine deficit reduction, including spending cuts and tax increases, with spending increases and targeted tax cuts for job-creation initiatives in areas like infrastructure, manufacturing, research and education. That is a formula closer to what the economists propose. But Republicans have insisted on spending cuts alone and smaller government as the key to economic growth.

The results, Mr. Obama has taken to saying, despite his complicity, are "self-inflicted wounds."

"The only way the problem does get fixed is if both parties sit down and they say, 'How are we going to make sure that we're reducing our deficit sensibly?'" he said last week at a news conference. "How are we making sure that we're investing in things like rebuilding our airports and our roads and our bridges, and investing in early childhood education, basic research—all the things that are going to help us grow?"

Mr. Obama added, "I cannot force Republicans to embrace those common-sense solutions."

Speaker John A. Boehner stood by the Republicans' policies during a session Tuesday with reporters. "After four years of mediocre job creation, it's obvious that we don't need more tax hikes and more government spending," he said. "We need smarter policies to make America more competitive and expand opportunities for everyone in our country."

"We're the ones pushing this town to do the right thing when it comes to the economy and jobs," Mr. Boehner added.

The Federal Open Market Committee, which sets policy for the central bank, noted signs of improvement in the private sector last week in a statement. "But fiscal policy is restraining economic growth," it added, echoing public comments that Ben S. Bernanke, the Fed chairman, has made for months. In April, the International Monetary Fund said the United States would achieve further growth "in the face of a very strong, indeed overly strong, fiscal consolidation."

Thursday will capture as plainly as any day lately the differing approaches of Mr. Obama and Republicans toward the economy and government's role.

Mr. Obama plans to travel to Austin, Tex., to visit technology students, workers and entrepreneurs and promote his ideas to support efforts like theirs—the kind of initiatives that Republicans have blocked.

House Republicans expect to pass a measure that would allow the Treasury to "prioritize" debt payments if Congress and Mr. Obama cannot agree this year to increase the nation's debt ceiling so the Treasury can keep borrowing money to pay all creditors. Under the bill, as tax receipts came in, the first priority would be paying creditors—like China, Democratic opponents argue—and second would be Social Security checks. But the measure would likely die in the Democratic-controlled Senate.

The "prioritization" proposal first arose in 2011 from among the most conservative House Republicans, those who were driving hardest against the White House on raising the debt ceiling and expressing unconcern about default, but it has now become mainstream in the House ranks.

Economists and financial analysts generally dismiss the idea as unworkable if not dangerous, and count on Democrats to block it. Gregory Daco, a senior principal economist at IHS Global Insight, said the Republicans' proposal was the kind that caused his clients to ignore the fiscal policy out of Washington, and rely instead on the Fed to buttress the recovery.

"Whenever I talk to our customers or clients, they sort of brush off everything that's related to fiscal policy," Mr. Daco said. "The view is, 'Oh, it doesn't matter.' That's what I hear a lot."

"What we try to convey is that it does matter," he said. "It is important in terms of growth. It's also important in terms of confidence."

He noted that the economy was much stronger than Europe's largely because the United States initially opted for stimulus measures and allowed deficits to increase when the recession and financial crisis hit five years ago. European governments pursued austerity policies to cut their debts, further stalling economic activity and in turn inflating deficits.

The more recent austerity policies here are helping to bring annual deficits down, as a new report of the Congressional Budget Office shows, after four years of trillion-dollar shortfalls. Yet many analysts would prefer that the measures had been timed for when the economy is strong and unemployment below 7 percent.

"While I agree that the U.S. must get its fiscal house in order," Jerry Webman, chief

economist at OppenheimerFunds, wrote, “I join the likes of the I.M.F. in cautioning that too much austerity, too soon, is likely counterproductive.”

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act, which is simply a plan to default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

Under this measure, the Treasury could not borrow above the federal debt limit for any other purpose than to pay selected holders of our debt, many of whom are outside the United States.

While supposedly prioritizing this debt, all other already-incurred debt would still be paid by general revenues on a cash-flow basis. Forcing Treasury to default on many of our fundamental obligations, such as paying our active-duty troops, paying doctors and hospitals that care for our seniors on Medicare, paying veterans' benefits, and before American small businesses are paid.

Raising the debt ceiling to pay bills already incurred should not be negotiable, and certainly should not be held hostage for cuts to programs that serve everyday Americans.

The pursuit of this bill is not in the best interest of Americans. It rebuts economists who say that debt prioritization is an awful, if not impossible policy, especially in light of the fact that the Treasury makes 80 to 100 million payments per month. The Bipartisan Policy Center and the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, as well as the Treasury itself, all agree on the conclusion that it would be simply impossible for them to pick and choose which bills are paid and which are not.

By virtually ensuring a state of daily defaults on legal obligations of the federal government, this misguided proposal is more likely to create chaos in credit markets than ease investors' fears.

We should not forget the lessons of 2011, when we last neared default over disagreements to raise the debt ceiling. Political brinksmanship with the debt ceiling caused uncertainty on Wall Street, the U.S. government's credit rating was downgraded for the first time in history, and we saw increases in borrowing costs to the tune of \$1.3 billion according to a report from the Government Accountability Office, which will add up to \$19 billion in unnecessary additional debt over the next decade.

The consequences of a default would be much worse and reverberate across our economy, affecting every American through higher interest rates, investors fleeing the U.S. market and broad economic uncertainty.

This legislation has a very clear purpose—forcing the United States government to default on its obligations during forthcoming debt ceiling negotiations.

America is not a delinquent nation, and we cannot risk becoming one. I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill, H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Full Faith and Credit Act. As a conservative, ensuring that our nation pays its bills on time is a top priority.

The Full Faith and Credit Act would protect America's credit rating by ensuring that we do not default on our nation's debt. It requires the Treasury to continue to make timely payments on our principal and interest in the event that our nation's debt limit is reached.

Furthermore, what this does is take the politicization of the debt limit debate off of the table. Without a chance for default, we can negotiate in good faith with the President and Congressional Democrats on a plan that addresses our real problem—out of control spending.

I look forward to having this debate, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act. Instead of working productively with Democrats, my Republican colleagues seem content to continue dabbling in debt limit chicanery that threatens the economic security of this country.

Let me be clear: H.R. 807 offers no comprehensive solution to the debt limit. It is a legislative blueprint for how the United States should pay its bills after it defaults. More baffling is the fact that the bill prioritizes debt payments to Chinese bondholders over paying our troops, supporting our veterans, and making Medicare payments to seniors.

That Republicans continue to push bills like this indicates they have no real interest in fixing the sequester or putting in place the kinds of policies that will contribute to stable economic growth. This will have a seriously debilitating effect on financial markets at a time when we can ill afford it. In addition, H.R. 807 could lead to another downgrade of our country's credit rating because the bill indicates to markets that it assumes a default will actually occur.

Madam Speaker, this is irresponsible policymaking at its finest. H.R. 807 threatens to undo the full faith and credit of the United States, a promise that has stood for over 200 years and is the foundation of global capital markets. I urge my colleagues to put aside partisan differences and act in the country's best interests by voting this bill down.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, the purpose of the Full Faith and Credit Act (H.R. 807) is to protect the full faith and credit of the United States by requiring the Treasury Secretary to issue such debt as may be necessary to prevent a sovereign default. During the consideration of this bill in the Ways and Means Committee, I offered an amendment to clarify the relationship between debt issued under the authority in this bill and the statutory debt limit. This amendment was adopted by voice vote and is part of the bill as ordered reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

This bill provides additional and limited authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue new debt obligations on behalf of the United States solely for the purpose of paying the principal and interest on specified debt obligations of the United States once the statutory debt limit has been reached. The intent of this bill is that debt obligations issued under the authority provided by the bill will count against the debt limit with one exception. This exception provides that if counting the full amount of these newly issued obligations against the debt limit would cause the debt limit to be exceeded, then the amount of the newly issued obligation that is in excess of the debt limit shall not count toward the limit.

The following is a hypothetical example to explain the intended operation of this bill. Assume the debt limit has been reached and the payment of principal and interest on an existing debt obligation amounting to \$100 requires the Treasury Secretary to issue \$101 of new

debt obligations using the authority provided in this Act. In this example, \$100 of that new obligation would count against the debt limit while \$1 would not. Importantly, applying this provision is a continual responsibility. If at some future date the stock of debt subject to the limit were reduced by \$1, then the \$1 that originally did not count against the debt limit would now count toward the debt limit. Under no circumstance can there be both room to issue new debt obligations without exceeding the statutory debt ceiling and an outstanding stock of debt obligations issued under the authority in this bill that is not subject to the debt limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit, if ordered; passage of H.R. 807, if ordered; and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 340, nays 84, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—340

Aderholt	Chabot	Forbes
Alexander	Chaffetz	Fortenberry
Amash	Chu	Foster
Amodei	Cicilline	Fox
Andrews	Coble	Frankel (FL)
Bachmann	Coffman	Franks (AZ)
Bachus	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Barber	Collins (GA)	Gabbard
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Gallego
Barr	Conaway	Garamendi
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Garcia
Barton	Cook	Gardner
Benishek	Cooper	Garrett
Bentivolio	Costa	Gerlach
Bera (CA)	Cotton	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Courtney	Gibson
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Black	Crowley	Gosar
Blackburn	Cuellar	Gowdy
Bonamici	Culberson	Granger
Bonner	Daines	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Brady (TX)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Bridenstine	DelBene	Griffin (AR)
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Grimm
Brown (GA)	DeSantis	Guthrie
Brownley (CA)	DesJarlais	Hahn
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Hall
Bucshon	Duckworth	Hanabusa
Burgess	Duffy	Hanna
Bustos	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Camp	Ellmers	Hartzer
Campbell	Enyart	Hastings (WA)
Cantor	Eshoo	Heck (NV)
Capito	Esty	Heck (WA)
Capps	Farenthold	Hensarling
Carney	Farr	Herrera Beutler
Carter	Fincher	Higgins
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	Himes
Cassidy	Fleischmann	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Fleming	Holding



Honda	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Horsford	Rodgers	Salmon
Hudson	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta
Huelskamp	Meadows	Scalise
Huizenga (MI)	Meehan	Schiff
Hultgren	Meng	Schneider
Hunter	Messer	Schock
Hurt	Mica	Schrader
Israel	Michaud	Schwartz
Issa	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Jackson Lee	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Jenkins	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Mullin	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Mulvaney	Sewell (AL)
Jones	Murphy (FL)	Sherman
Jordan	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus
Joyce	Napolitano	Shuster
Keating	Negrete McLeod	Simpson
Kelly (IL)	Neugebauer	Sinema
Kelly (PA)	Noem	Slaughter
Kilmer	Nolan	Smith (NE)
Kind	Nugent	Smith (NJ)
King (IA)	Nunes	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Nunnelee	Southerland
Kingston	O'Rourke	Stewart
Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Stivers
Kirkpatrick	Owens	Stockman
Kline	Palazzo	Stutzman
Kuster	Pastor (AZ)	Swell (CA)
Labrador	Paulsen	Takano
LaMalfa	Perry	Terry
Lamborn	Peters (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Lance	Peters (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Langevin	Peterson	Thornberry
Lankford	Petri	Tiberi
Larson (CT)	Pittenger	Tierney
Latham	Pitts	Tipton
Latta	Poe (TX)	Titus
Lipinski	Pollis	Tonko
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Turner
Loeback	Posey	Upton
Loftgren	Price (GA)	Valadao
Long	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Lowenthal	Quigley	Vargas
Lowey	Radel	Veasey
Lucas	Rahall	Vela
Luetkemeyer	Rangel	Wagner
Lujan Grisham	Reed	Walberg
(NM)	Reichert	Walden
Luján, Ben Ray	Renacci	Walorski
(NM)	Ribble	Walz
Lummis	Rice (SC)	Waxman
Lynch	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Maffei	Roby	Webster (FL)
Maloney, Sean	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
Markey	Rogers (MI)	Williams
Massie	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
Matheson	Rokita	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Wolf
McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
McClintock	Roskam	Woodall
McCollum	Ross	Woodard
McHenry	Rothfus	Yoder
McIntyre	Royce	Yoho
McKeon	Ruiz	Young (AK)
McKinley	Runyan	Young (FL)
	Ruppersberger	Young (IN)

## NAYS—84

Bass	Fudge	Nadler
Beatty	Grayson	Neal
Becerra	Grijalva	Pallone
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Brown (FL)	Holt	Pelosi
Butterfield	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Capuano	Huffman	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Clarke	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kennedy	T.
Cleaver	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Levin	Scott, David
Cummings	Lewis	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Maloney,	Shea-Porter
DeGette	Carolyn	Sires
Delaney	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McDermott	Velázquez
Doyle	McGovern	Visclosky
Edwards	Meeks	Wasserman
Ellison	Miller, George	Schultz
Engel	Moore	
Fattah	Moran	

Waters	Watt	Wilson (FL)
	Welch	Yarmuth
	NOT VOTING—8	
Davis (CA)	Pearce	Speier
Doggett	Pingree (ME)	Tsongas
Flores	Ryan (OH)	

□ 1111

Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. VELA, COURTNEY, BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, POLIS, HINOJOSA, HIGGINS, Ms. BONAMICI, Messrs. HONDA, and TIERNEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 140, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAFFEI. In its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Maffei moves to recommit the bill H.R. 807 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

**SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON DEFAULT THAT PAYS CHINA FIRST INSTEAD OF PROTECTING AMERICA'S SENIORS, VETERANS, AND THOSE HARMED BY NATURAL DISASTERS.**

This Act shall not take effect if it would result in the United States Government defaulting on its legal obligations for the first time in its history, as evidenced by the Secretary of the Treasury taking any of the following actions:

(1) Making payments of debt obligations to foreign bond holders, including those in China, Iran, and the Cayman Islands, before making payments of debt obligations required under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, for the Deposit Insurance Fund and the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund, which insure savings for Americans.

(2) Failing to make a payment of a debt obligation to the Social Security and Medicare trust funds or redeem a debt obligation held by those trust funds.

(3) Failing to redeem a debt obligation held by a trust fund providing veterans benefits, including the Veterans Special Life Insurance Fund, the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund, the Armed Forces Retirement Home Fund, and the Court of Veteran Appeals Retirement Fund.

(4) Failing to redeem a debt obligation held by an intragovernmental fund with the purpose of assisting Americans during a natural

disaster, including reserves for the National Flood Insurance Program and other disaster relief funds appropriated to the President.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, I am offering this amendment today as the final amendment, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, the American people want us to work together—Republicans and Democrats—to reduce our debt, pay our bills, and avoid an economic catastrophe, which would result from default. But how can Democrats work with the Republican leaders of this House when their plan for America is to default?

Madam Speaker, Republicans today proved this by bringing forth this legislation, which presumes it will happen and maps out not if but what happens when the United States defaults.

Their plan ensures that foreign creditors such as China, Japan, and OPEC countries Iran and Saudi Arabia would continue to get paid while we halt other payments to groups of Americans who have earned those benefits. This bill prioritizes Chinese lenders ahead of American seniors and veterans and college students. That's why it's called the Pay China First Act.

The House Republican bill would stop pay for 1.4 million Active Duty troops and almost 800,000 activated Reserves and National Guards. It would end benefits for 3.4 million disabled Americans; eliminate education benefits and home purchasing assistance for 1.3 million veterans; put American small businesses that sell goods and services to the government on the hook for major losses; and stop payment to doctors and hospitals who take care of the 50 million Medicare patients around this country.

□ 1120

Madam Speaker, the Republican plan that we debate here today ignores the needs and priorities of the American people; and it does so, Madam Speaker, so that the Republican leadership can sidestep the political problem that, after being fully complicit in running up our Nation's credit card debt, their side doesn't want to pay the bill.

It strains the bounds of cynicism to think that any elected leaders would prioritize a policy of political convenience over the well-being of those injured from fighting for America's freedom; but that is what's happening today.

We need to come together as a Nation to fix our debt, and we need to do it in the right way, not on the backs of our middle class families and seniors, and certainly not by defaulting on the debt we owe our veterans.

Instead of finding ways to pay China first, we should be using this time to find a way to balance our budget and avoid defaulting on any of our obligations.

We should be working together to come up with a plan that addresses the very serious fiscal challenges facing this country. And these are not easy choices, but they are why our constituents sent us here, Democrats and Republicans, to answer the challenges of our time as our forebears did in theirs.

The brinksmanship that Congress has put us in time and time again has created uncertainty in the economy. It prevents economic growth. It stifles job creation.

This Republican plan will plunge our recovering economy back into a recession. It will raise unemployment. It might even freeze credit worldwide. It is a reckless plan to default for the first time in our Nation's history, and economists agree it will be devastating.

What this side is proposing is nothing but a plan to fail.

Madam Speaker, I didn't come here to plan to fail. I came here to focus on jobs and growth and a stronger middle class and promote a commonsense budget that's balanced and fair, that expands our economy and responsibly reduces deficit.

Instead of prioritizing China and foreign sovereign funds, we should be protecting our American troops who are in harm's way as we speak, our veterans; our seniors who rely on Medicare and Social Security; American small businesses; and college students who earned Pell Grants.

That's what this amendment does. It would stop the horrible consequences of default. It is a simple choice: plan to default on our debts or reject this plan and work together to avert catastrophe.

Which one will my Republican colleagues choose today?

Madam Speaker, above your august chair, and even above our great American Flag, the symbol of freedom, are the words: In God We Trust. And through good times and bad, that trust has been rewarded.

Madam Speaker, the American people, our seniors who depend on Medicare, our students who have worked hard to earn a Pell Grant to pay for college, our small businesses who have sold their wares to the Federal Government at a fair price, and our veterans who have sacrificed for our freedom, they have put their trust in us.

For 237 years, this Nation has paid its debts, not just some of them, like the ones to foreign creditors. Our forebears have always kept faith with the American people. They didn't pick and choose. They did their duty, and so must we.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, you know, this body just spent the last hour listening to the other side saying how we can't default. But the irony of this motion to recommit is it actually mandates default. The irony of this motion is that it mandates default that would send our economy into a tailspin. It would ensure that nobody gets paid.

Vote "no" on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 227, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

#### AYES—200

Andrews  
Barber  
Barrow (GA)  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duncan (TN)

Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin

Lewis  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Loftgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Markay  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)

Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz

Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko

Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

#### NOES—227

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy

Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen

Perry  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Radel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—5

Braley (IA) Flores Pearce  
Doggett Kelly (IL)

□ 1132

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 141 had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 141 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 207, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

## YEAS—221

Aderholt	Fleming	Lummis
Alexander	Forbes	Marchant
Amodei	Fortenberry	Marino
Bachmann	Fox	McCarthy (CA)
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Barletta	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Barr	Gardner	McHenry
Barton	Garrett	McKeon
Benish	Gerlach	McKinley
Bentivolio	Gibbs	McMorris
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Meadows
Black	Goodlatte	Meehan
Blackburn	Gosar	Messer
Bonner	Gowdy	Mica
Boustany	Granger	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary
Brooks (AL)	Griffin (AR)	Mullin
Brooks (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Mulvaney
Brown (GA)	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Buchanan	Hall	Neugebauer
Bucshon	Hanna	Noem
Burgess	Harper	Nugent
Calvert	Harris	Nunes
Camp	Hartzler	Nunnelee
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	Olson
Cantor	Heck (NV)	Palazzo
Capito	Hensarling	Paulsen
Carter	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Cassidy	Holding	Petri
Chabot	Hudson	Pittenger
Chaffetz	Huelskamp	Pitts
Coble	Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)
Coffman	Hultgren	Pompeo
Cole	Hunter	Posey
Collins (GA)	Hurt	Price (GA)
Collins (NY)	Issa	Radel
Conaway	Jenkins	Reed
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Cotton	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Cramer	Jordan	Ribble
Crawford	Joyce	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rigell
Culberson	King (IA)	Roby
Daines	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	Kline	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rokita
Duffy	Lamborn	Rooney
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Roskam
Ellmers	Latham	Ross
Farenthold	Latta	Rothfus
Fincher	Long	Royce
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Runyan
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)

Salmon  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stewart

Amash  
Andrews  
Barber  
Barrow (GA)  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Dent  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gibson  
Grayson  
Green, Al

Doggett  
Flores

Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski

## NAYS—207

Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Markey  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano

## NOT VOTING—4

Pearce  
Peterson

□ 1139

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 140, answered “present” 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

## YEAS—264

Aderholt	Eshoo	McCaul
Alexander	Esty	McClintock
Amodei	Farenthold	McCollum
Bachmann	Farr	McHenry
Bachus	Fattah	McKeon
Barber	Fincher	McKinley
Barletta	Fleischmann	McNerney
Barr	Fortenberry	Meadows
Barrow (GA)	Foster	Meeks
Barton	Frankel (FL)	Messer
Becerra	Frelinghuysen	Mica
Bentivolio	Gabbard	Michaud
Bera (CA)	Gallego	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Garrett	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Miller, Gary
Black	Goodlatte	Moran
Blackburn	Gosar	Mullin
Blumenauer	Gowdy	Mulvaney
Bonamici	Granger	Murphy (FL)
Bonner	Grayson	Murphy (PA)
Boustany	Grimm	Nadler
Brady (TX)	Guthrie	Napolitano
Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	Neugebauer
Bridenstine	Hahn	Noem
Brooks (AL)	Hall	Nugent
Brooks (IN)	Hanabusa	Nunes
Brown (GA)	Harper	Nunnelee
Brownley (CA)	Harris	O'Rourke
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Olson
Bucshon	Heck (WA)	Payne
Bustos	Higgins	Pelosi
Calvert	Himes	Perlmutter
Camp	Hinojosa	Perry
Campbell	Holt	Peters (CA)
Cantor	Horsford	Petri
Capito	Huelskamp	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Huffman	Pocan
Cárdenas	Hurt	Polis
Carney	Issa	Pompeo
Carter	Johnson (GA)	Posey
Cartwright	Johnson, Sam	Price (NC)
Cassidy	Kaptur	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Keating	Reichert
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ribble
Cicilline	Kennedy	Rice (SC)
Clay	Kildee	Richmond
Coble	King (NY)	Roby
Cole	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Collins (NY)	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Cook	Kuster	Rogers (KY)
Cooper	Labrador	Rogers (MI)
Cramer	LaMalfa	Rokita
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Cuellar	Langevin	Roskam
Culberson	Lankford	Ross
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Rothfus
Daines	Latta	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Royce
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Ruiz
DeGette	Lofgren	Runyan
Delaney	Long	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lowe	Ryan (WI)
DelBene	Lucas	Scalise
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Schiff
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Schneider
Diaz-Balart	(NM)	Schrader
Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray	Schwartz
Duncan (SC)	(NM)	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Ellison	Marino	Scott, David
Ellmers	Massie	Sensenbrenner
Engel	McCarthy (CA)	Serrano
Enyart	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions

Sewell (AL)	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Shea-Porter	Thornberry	Watt
Sherman	Titus	Weber (TX)
Shuster	Tonko	Webster (FL)
Simpson	Tsongas	Welch
Sinema	Upton	Westmoreland
Smith (NE)	Van Hollen	Williams
Smith (NJ)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Smith (TX)	Vela	Wilson (SC)
Smith (WA)	Wagner	Wittman
Speier	Walden	Wolf
Stewart	Walorski	Womack
Stutzman	Walz	Yarmuth
Swalwell (CA)	Wasserman	Young (FL)
Takano	Schultz	Young (IN)

## NAYS—140

Amash	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
Andrews	Griffith (VA)	Pallone
Bass	Hartzler	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Hastings (FL)	Paulsen
Benishek	Heck (NV)	Peters (MI)
Bishop (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Honda	Pittenger
Broun (GA)	Hoyer	Poe (TX)
Burgess	Hudson	Price (GA)
Carson (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Radel
Castor (FL)	Hunter	Rahall
Chaffetz	Israel	Reed
Chu	Jackson Lee	Renacci
Clarke	Jeffries	Rigell
Cleaver	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Clyburn	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Coffman	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Collins (GA)	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Conaway	Jordan	Salmon
Connolly	Joyce	Sánchez, Linda
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	T.
Costa	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Cotton	Kind	Sarbanes
Courtney	Kinzinger (IL)	Schakowsky
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Schock
Crowley	Lance	Sires
Davis, Rodney	Latham	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Southerland
Denham	Levin	Stivers
Dent	Lewis	Stockman
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Terry
Dingell	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Maffei	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	Maloney,	Tiberi
Fitzpatrick	Carolyn	Tipton
Fleming	Maloney, Sean	Turner
Foxx	Markey	Valadao
Fudge	Matheson	Veasey
Garamendi	Matsui	Velázquez
Garcia	McDermott	Visclosky
Gardner	McIntyre	Walberg
Gerlach	Meehan	Wenstrup
Gibson	Meng	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, George	Yoder
Graves (GA)	Moore	Yoho
Graves (MO)	Neal	Young (AK)
Green, Al	Negrete McLeod	
Green, Gene	Nolan	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

## NOT VOTING—27

Bishop (GA)	Hanna	Pascarell
Butterfield	Hensarling	Pearce
Capuano	Holding	Pitts
Cohen	Hultgren	Quigley
Doggett	King (IA)	Shimkus
Flores	Larson (CT)	Tierney
Forbes	Lowenthal	Waxman
Franks (AZ)	McGovern	Whitfield
Gohmert	McMorris	
Grijalva	Rodgers	

□ 1147

Mrs. BEATTY changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall vote 142 to H.R. 807 taken on May 9, 2013. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted "aye."

I was not present for this vote due to a speaking engagement at Texas A&M University.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 142, I am not recorded because I was absent from the House of Representatives for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

The message also announced that the Senate has a passed bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 622. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

□ 1150

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come. Mr. BRADY, as I understand, is the designee of the majority leader, and I welcome and appreciate his participation.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. First, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 2 p.m. in pro forma session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and at noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions on Tuesday and Wednesday, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I expect the House to consider H.R. 45, a bill sponsored by Representative MICHELE BACHMANN, to fully repeal ObamaCare.

We will also consider H.R. 1062, the SEC Regulatory Accountability Act, authored by Representative SCOTT GARRETT. This bill requires the SEC to conduct cost benefit analysis on any rulemaking to ensure that the benefits outweigh the costs.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information and, again, I want to thank him. I know that the majority leader could not be here and he's filling in, and I appreciate the fact that he is doing so.

Mr. BRADY, I notice that there is not on the notice for the schedule for next

week any reference about a motion to go to conference on the budget. As you know, the Senate has now passed a budget, which it had not done for some years. Your side, in particular, but all of us wanted the Senate to pass a budget. They have now passed a budget. We passed a budget. We would hope on this side of the aisle that we would now go to conference.

I'm wondering whether the gentleman can—in light of the fact that it is regular order that two sides pass, now try to compromise the differences that exist between the two Houses—can the gentleman tell me whether or not there is a plan to go to conference and, if so, what that schedule might be? And I yield to my friend.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you. As you know, Chairman RYAN and Chairman MURRAY are in discussions about the budget. It is I think encouraging that for the first time in 4 years this is actually occurring, the Senate has finally passed a budget.

But we know both sides take a considerably different view toward our financial budget future. These talks are aimed at sort of narrowing those differences. We certainly don't want to short-circuit those discussions because we're all encouraged.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the fact that you're encouraged. Frankly, our side has not heard an encouraging word. In fact, we continue to hear discouraging words, as the song says.

I'm very hopeful we can bridge the gap that exists, which is about \$100 billion, as the gentleman knows. The Senate marked \$1.058 trillion, which of course was consistent with the Budget Control Act that we agreed upon, we voted on, and passed. The President signed the Budget Control Act, including that figure for the fiscal year '14 budget. The Ryan budget, as you know reflects a \$966 billion 302 allocation; that is, general discretionary spending levels.

I'm wondering when you say you're encouraged, do you know whether there's been any progress toward trying to bridge that gap? Obviously, as a former appropriator, many times it's 50/50 you come to the middle, which would be about \$1 trillion or a little more than that. I'm wondering whether or not the gentleman knows whether any progress has been made on that? And I yield to my friend.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you for yielding. As you know, there are significant differences. The Senate budget includes over \$1 trillion in new tax hikes on small businesses and families, which would be very damaging for the economy. The Senate Democrat bill adds I think about \$8 trillion to the deficit and doesn't take what we think are critical steps to saving Social Security and Medicare over the long haul. That's why these discussions, I think, are so critical.

Again, I'm encouraged that both sides are discussing them, trying to

find a way to narrow them, and we ought to give them time to be able to continue those discussions.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Just let me observe that on our side we think it would be useful if the American public had the opportunity to, in effect, see the discussions in a conference. I've been here long enough to remember when we had conferences on the Appropriations Committee. They were open to the public. They were reported on. We had discussions about the differences that existed, as one would expect, from people elected from different parts of the country and with different views. But we think it would be very helpful if those discussions were held, because the differences are pretty profound and pretty significant, that it would help the public to have a better understanding of the process.

In addition, as the gentleman knows, of course, there was some discussion about the President's coming down late with his budget. We should have been through the budget process by now so that the Appropriations Committee could proceed with its allocations to its 12 subcommittees.

In that context, I would ask the gentleman, does the gentleman have any idea when the appropriations bills might be marked up and brought to the floor? As you know, under regular order, for the most part, we have brought appropriations bills to the floor starting in mid-May or the last week in May so that we could get through that process in June and July and send those bills to the Senate so that we might have conferences and complete our work by October 1.

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you for yielding. I agree with you about the importance of moving our appropriations bill.

The majority leader has announced we will begin the process of funding our government in June through an open appropriation, and through those appropriation seasons will work with the Appropriations Committee to determine which bills will come to the floor in June, as we have continued to do for the last number of years.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I appreciate that and I look forward to the consideration of the appropriations bills on the floor.

I want to say that for the most part you have followed open rules, which we did as well in 2007 until we just couldn't get the bills done in a timely fashion. Hopefully, we can do that, because I think that, again, it gives the public the opportunity to see the priorities of not only each Member but both sides moving forward. I think that's appropriate in a democracy. I appreciate the fact that the majority leader intends to bring those bills to the floor starting in June. I'm not sure whether we can finish all 12 in June, but perhaps finish those in July.

We did not bring, as the gentleman knows, the Labor and Health bill to the

full committee in the last cycle, much less to the floor. That bill will be tough.

Chairman ROGERS—I know the gentleman is on a committee that he believes is more important. He and I may differ in that perception. He's a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I was a former member of the Appropriations Committee. But, nonetheless, Mr. ROGERS has made the observation, in terms of the dollars allocated in the Ryan budget for discretionary spending, both on the defense side and non-defense side:

I suspect there will be some who will be shocked. I don't think people yet understand how severe the numbers will be.

Those numbers refer to the \$966 billion in discretionary spending, which will require deep cuts in almost every program on the national defense side and on the discretionary side.

So, the sooner we get to that, because I think it's going to be a difficult process, the better. And I appreciate your information with reference to the majority leader's intent to bring them to the floor.

Now, I also did not see on the schedule, Mr. BRADY, anything that deals with the sequester. I do see the Affordable Care Act repeal on the floor next week, which has been, of course, on this floor some 33, 34, 35 times before, to repeal it. We're having another repeal vote coming up. I think honestly you believe, as I believe, that that bill is not going to go anywhere, other than perhaps through the House of Representatives, but, beyond that, it won't go anywhere.

However, the sequester continues to be an ongoing challenge to our country, to our government, and to our people. We dealt with it in a sort of surgical fashion dealing with the FAA, but we have not dealt with any of the other concerns. As the gentleman knows, I have concerns about the fact the sequester may result in 70,000 children not being on Head Start. They are only 3 or 4 years of age once.

□ 1200

The Social Security Administration may have to furlough payments, which will slow down payments of Social Security. There are 4 million fewer Meals on Wheels for seniors. There are 600,000 people who have been dropped off the Women, Infants, and Children program. There are 125,000 fewer HUD rental assistance vouchers for people who are homeless or who are struggling to keep a home. Unemployment insurance has been cut 11 percent for 2 million out-of-work Americans. We now have no safety net for them. The FDA will have 2,100 fewer food safety inspectors—that's down 18 percent—obviously, putting at risk our food safety; and we will furlough an equivalent to 1,000 fewer Federal agents, FBI—we know from the Boston Marathon bombings how critical the FBI was—and border security. One-third of combat air units have been grounded.

I mention all of those simply in the context of those consequences of the sequester. I see it's not on next week, and we have a week after that that we'll be in session. Does the gentleman have any information with reference to whether or not we will deal with trying to ameliorate these adverse consequences of sequester before we leave here for the Memorial Day break?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you for yielding. As you may remember, the President proposed this sequester originally in discussions about the budget and has threatened to veto any legislative efforts to turn off that sequester. Perhaps that's why Republicans, Democrats, and the President recently signed legislation that locks in those lower spending levels for the remainder of the budget year, and Congress has provided the administration the flexibility to cut funding from the nonpriority provisions, areas, of the budget so we can prioritize those important areas that you discussed.

As we all remember, what the sequester did was take, in effect, a 500-pound government and insisted that it lose 10 pounds. That's what the sequester does—a minor amount but important because this Nation is running such dangerously high deficits.

So, clearly, there is bipartisan agreement on the spending levels for the budget for the rest of the year. I think that's the regular appropriations process that Chairman ROGERS is bringing forward in which we'll have a chance, Republicans and Democrats, to amend it, to get our ideas to the floor. I think that adds extra importance to that process.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments; but I do want to observe that the President of the United States has offered a budget which eliminates the sequester and gets to a budget deficit reduction and fiscal sustainability in an alternative way which we think is much more positive.

I would also remind the gentleman that CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, offered an alternative which gets rid of the sequester, which all sides agree is an irrational process in that it cuts the highest priority and lowest priority the same. The sequester, as the gentleman knows, was put in a bill to force action with the specific belief and premise that the sequester was so bad, so irrational, so lacking in common sense, so negative in its impact that it would never be adopted. Sadly, it was adopted.

I want to say also that the gentleman and a lot of his colleagues like to mention that this is the President's suggestion. With all due respect, Jack Lew brought it up with Mr. REID, and everybody has read about that in Mr. Woodward's book. He brought it up, however—and the gentleman probably recalls this—days after sequester, as a policy, was included in the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill for which 229 Republicans voted for as a policy. I want to

tell the gentleman just for his future information, on our side, we are opposed to the sequester. We want to see the sequester changed.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN not only offered a budget, but he offered four amendments. Each time we considered the CR and other legislation, four times he offered an amendment to substitute the same savings so we would get to those budget deficit reductions to which the gentleman spoke, but would not do so in the irrational, across-the-board fashion that sequester requires.

So I want to make it clear, if there was any confusion on your side of the aisle, we are not for the sequester. I voted for the CR to keep the government open, but I voted against the CR, when it left this House, which had sequester in there. I, frankly, thought shutting down the government was even worse than the sequester, but I think the sequester is having a harmful effect, not only on government, but a harmful effect on our economy. I think it's a drip, drip, drip. It wasn't a "shut the door." It wasn't black and white. It wasn't overnight, but it is a drip, drip, drip that is harming our economy.

I understand what the gentleman has told us, but I would hope that we would seriously consider trying to see if we could reach agreement either outside the context of the budget conference or inside the context of the budget conference that would give us an alternative which would be more rational, more positive, and more helpful to our economy.

The next subject is simply the debt ceiling. We just passed a bill on the prioritization. We unanimously opposed that on our side. We think that is not a good policy. Obviously, there is a disagreement on that. May 19 is the date that the debt ceiling extension expires.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any proposal to act in the near future other than on debt prioritization, which will have no chance in the Senate and is roundly opposed by many Republican economists, as the gentleman knows, and by the former economic adviser to the Bush administration, who said that it would not work, should not work? Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any alternative plan, before we leave here for the Memorial Day break, to give confidence to the economy and to creditors and to the American people that we will deal responsibly with the debt limit extension?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Well, thank you for yielding. I was disappointed in today's action in the sense that I think it is dangerous to flirt with default. America ought to pay its debt, and we ought to reassure investors here at home—our local retirement funds that have bought U.S. Treasury, the Social Security trust fund, itself, that gets paid back interest, as well as other investors—that America will not default. I was disappointed this was made a par-

tisan issue when, in fact, I think flirting with it and getting to the brink has really been damaging to our economy, and I think choosing for default was a mistake by your colleagues.

I am hopeful that the Senate will take it up and that there will be a more bipartisan effort to assure that we are going to actually pay our bills and then focus on the real problem, which is dangerously high deficits, the fact that we're not acting now to save Social Security and Medicare—such critical programs.

In the House, we've begun the discussions to identify what those priorities are to move us back toward a balanced budget without raising taxes on local families and businesses. We've begun the process of identifying good, positive ideas that would restore confidence in America's financial future, and we think it is important this moves along in a very deliberate, timely manner so that we don't end up with an 11th-hour issue.

I think this is a reasonable, appropriate way to deal with a huge, dramatically larger debt borrowing amount than America has ever seen—so many trillions piled up in the last few years and more piling up for the future. We don't think the answer is taking more of what people earn; it is Congress coming together, Republicans and Democrats, and finding a way to get our financial house in order, move back toward a balanced budget and act to save Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Of course, we did have a balanced budget, as you'll remember, for the last 4 years of the Clinton administration. Now, there was a Republican-controlled Congress; but in the next 4 years, there was a Republican-controlled Congress, a Republican-controlled Senate, and a Republican President, and we went deeply into debt.

□ 1210

We escalated the debt during the Bush administration by 87 percent of GDP more than this President has escalated the deficit. In nominal terms, as Mr. CAMP observed before, the dollars are higher. That's true. It's because we are bigger, spending more money, making more money as a country. GDP is up.

During the Reagan administration, we increased the debt as a percentage of the national GDP by 186 percent; 55 percent under George Bush; 37 percent under Mr. Clinton; and some 40-plus percent under this President today.

So I think the gentleman and I agree that we need to get a handle on the debt and the deficit, but we disagree on how this happened. It happened because we didn't pay our bills, and we jettisoned PAYGO in 2003. As a practical matter, we jettisoned it in 2001.

Not paying for things is what creates debt, not buying. If I buy things and I pay for them, I don't have a debt. If I buy things and don't pay for them, I have a debt.

So it's not a question of what I buy, although clearly we need to restrain buying and we need to constrain spending, as I've said, all across the board—the gentleman has heard me—including entitlements, including discretionary defense and nondefense spending. But what we ought to do is manage our finances in a way that does not give pause to the American people or to the economy.

I want to just read for you a quote. Keith Hennessy was George Bush's National Economic Council director who disagrees with your proposition that this prioritization will in any way stabilize—I don't think the gentleman disagrees with me that that bill is not going to pass the Senate. Here's what Keith Hennessy said:

Payment prioritization doesn't stop payments; it just delays them. Then the aggrieved party sues the government and probably wins, and it turns into a bloody mess.

Tony Fratto, who was the spokesman on economic policy in the Bush administration said this:

Prioritization is impossible. Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, rent, contract payments, et cetera, in order to pay off Treasury bondholders?

We refer to this, of course, as the Pay China First bill. And China ought to be paid. We borrowed money from them; we ought to pay them.

Here's what he concludes of the prioritization bill:

That would be a political catastrophe.

I suggest it would be an economic catastrophe, as well, to say to our armed services personnel, We're not going to pay you, but we are going to pay China for our debts.

The fact of the matter is the United States is the most creditworthy Nation on Earth. We ought to pay all of our debts and not on a priority status. If we owe you as the United States of America, we're going to pay you. That's our proposition. We should not prioritize paying simply bondholders, but paying smaller contractors we are doing business with who offer us services and products and we don't pay them until after we pay our bondholders. We ought to pay everybody. That's what America is about.

So I would hope that we could revisit this because your debt prioritization is not going to pass. You know it's not going to pass. We need to get to a responsible way of dealing with the debt-limit extension.

Both parties, I will tell my friend, have demagogued on this issue. We demagogued on it when we had a Republican President; you've demagogued on it—not you personally. I cast no aspersions. But both sides have demagogued on it when the President was of the other party. It's a shame. It's not been good for our country.

Ronald Reagan said that Congress continues to run us up. And we ran us up so close last time that for the first time in history, the United States of America was downgraded by one of our



rating agencies. I would hope the gentleman who serves on the Ways and Means Committee and I and others could work together so this doesn't happen again, that we make sure that the American people and that all of our creditors and people around the world know that the United States of America can and will handle its finances in a responsible fashion.

If the gentleman wants to say anything further, I'll yield back to him; if not, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2013, TO MONDAY, MAY 13, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 3, 2013, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### HONORING DR. SHIRLEY TILGHMAN

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Shirley Tilghman for her distinguished service as the 19th president of Princeton University.

Dr. Tilghman will step down this spring following 12 years of exceptional leadership. As the first woman to serve as president of Princeton, she is a role model for the campus community and young women and men across the country and throughout the world.

During her tenure, Dr. Tilghman, a molecular biologist, set in motion a number of significant initiatives. Princeton increased its financial aid offerings significantly, raising the percentage of students who receive aid and making Princeton's program one of the most generous in the country.

Dr. Tilghman has also worked diligently to bolster the university's academic offerings, overseeing the creation of the Lewis Center for the Arts, the Center for African American Studies, the Princeton Neuroscience Institute, and the Andlinger Center for Energy and the Environment.

As a proud Princeton alumnus, it is an honor to recognize Dr. Tilghman today. May the university continue to be guided by Woodrow Wilson's 1896 words, true also of President Tilghman's labors: "Princeton in the Nation's service," and now expanded to include in the service of all nations.

Our congratulations to Dr. Shirley Tilghman.

#### NURSES WEEK AND POLIO ERADICATION

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Nurses Week and to thank the millions of nurses who are on the front lines of our health care system.

Although a doctor is usually considered to be the primary health care provider for a patient, nurses are expert clinicians who provide high-quality and cost-effective care in every community throughout our country.

Around the world, nurses are the first and often the only link to health care for millions living in developing countries and are true warriors against diseases like malaria, HIV/AIDS, and polio.

Thanks to the work of nurses and community health workers, we are close to a polio-free world and could not have come so far without the leadership of the United States, the Gates Foundation, and, of course, partners like the United Nations and Rotary International.

As we thank and salute nurses around the world, we must also recognize the severe shortages of health workers and recommit ourselves to supporting programs and policies that have the greatest impact and farthest reach.

Once again, we must end polio now.

#### TRIBUTE TO MEGAN BELL

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and give thanks to the very first person that came to work for me when I came to Congress 5 years ago, my legislative director, Megan Bell.

Unfortunately, she is going to be leaving our office as she goes on to bigger and better things. But Megan has been a tremendous and tireless public servant for the people of southeast Louisiana and has provided great leadership to our Nation. She's been a huge help to me on energy issues, on health care issues, on coastal restoration issues, and so many things. When the *Deepwater Horizon* accident and disaster occurred 3 years ago, Megan was right there helping not only to get people back to work, but also to help draft and lead through the legislative process the RESTORE Act, which provided incredible support to the people back home. She also provided great help to constituents.

On a Friday afternoon, when we got a call from a father whose son needed lifesaving treatment, she worked through the whole weekend to get FDA approval for a lifesaving clinical trial.

She's just a great public servant, somebody that I think we can all aspire and look up to. We will miss her

here at the Capitol, and I surely will miss her at the office. But she will be going on to bigger and better things, and I wish her all the best.

□ 1220

#### SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Safe Climate Caucus is composed of 25 Members of the House who have made a commitment to talk every single legislative day on the House floor about the urgent need to address climate change.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, we reached record levels of carbon in the atmosphere. Since 1956, a U.S. observatory has been recording data on the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere; and over the last few decades, carbon dioxide levels have been higher than at any point in the last 800,000 years. So there's more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere today than since the dawn of civilization.

This month, the amount of carbon is close to reaching 400 parts per million, a new record. And as a result, extreme weather events are going to be evermore frequent and more damaging.

We must act before it's too late. Our window to address the threat of climate change is closing. It's time to stop the denials and to start acting proactively.

#### SERVICEMEMBERS' TELEMEDICINE AND E-HEALTH PORTABILITY ACT IMPLEMENTATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, I worked with the Congressional Armed Services Committee to include the Servicemembers' Telemedicine and E-Health Portability Act, or STEP Act, as part of the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act.

The law expands telemedicine at the Department of Defense by allowing credentialed care professionals to perform telehealth consultations across State lines, which is great news for our servicemembers, especially those facing mental illness. Instead of waiting weeks for consultation, these men and women can now access care without delay while avoiding the stigma that is oftentimes associated with seeking treatment.

Last year, the DOD issued a waiver to expand telemedicine and begin implementation. In 2012, the Army was able to perform nearly 36,000 teleconsultations.

Despite progress, TRICARE providers were not included in the waiver, limiting thousands of professionals from providing services. Second, the waiver

does not allow servicemembers to use telemedicine from their homes, but what better way to avoid the stigma of seeking treatment than to access care from the privacy of one's home.

For our servicemembers to reap the STEP Act's full intended benefit, the Pentagon must fully implement this law.

#### HONORING FALLEN SERVICEMEMBERS

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize five servicemembers who died last Saturday in Afghanistan. First Lieutenant Brandon Landrum; Staff Sergeant Francis Phillips; Specialist Kevin Cardoza; Specialist Brandon Prescott; and Specialist Thomas Murach were killed by an IED while on patrol in Kandahar province. All five had been awarded both a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart, and all five were stationed at Fort Bliss in the district I represent.

Since 2011, Fort Bliss has lost 83 soldiers in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. This incredible loss of life has deeply impacted the families, friends, and fellow soldiers of the fallen, as well as the Fort Bliss and El Paso communities.

Each casualty reminds us of the ongoing human toll of the Afghanistan war, now going into its 12th year, and increasingly out of sight for many Americans. The terrible loss of these five soldiers reminds us of our solemn responsibility to our servicemembers, not only to be cautious when sending them into harm's way, but also knowing when it is time to bring them home.

#### SENATE IMMIGRATION BILL THREATENS NATIONAL SECURITY

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Immigration Studies has analyzed the Senate immigration bill and found that it threatens our national security.

For example, it allows examiners to grant asylum on the spot to arriving claimants without giving them background checks. It prohibits the prosecution of claimants for any criminal passport or visa fraud violation if they have a pending claim for asylum, whether or not it is frivolous. The bill fails to create an entry and exit tracking system at land ports where most foreigners enter. It waives existing grounds of ineligibility for illegal immigrants seeking amnesty, including bars for terrorism risks. So it appears that even the 9/11 terrorists could qualify for legalization under the Senate immigration bill. Incredibly, it even al-

lows the reentry and legalization of those from terrorist-sponsoring countries who have been deported.

How bad does it have to get before there is a popular uprising to oppose this bill?

#### DECENT PAY AND BENEFITS FOR CONTRACT WORKERS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday low-income workers in Federal buildings held an impressive rally and press conference at Union Station. They serve the public and the Federal Government under contracts in Federal buildings nationwide, like the Ronald Reagan Building, often without benefits and a living wage. Despite their hard work, their employers, who are Federal contractors, off-load the cost of benefits they should provide, such as health care, onto the taxpayers. It is a zero-sum game.

These working poor do not earn enough to live on, and taxpayers often pick up the tab with food stamps and health care that employers who pay a decent wage shoulder themselves.

This is why we need administrative action to ensure that retail and commercial vendors who enjoy the prestige of contracts with the Federal Government at sites like the Smithsonian offer decent pay with benefits, putting everybody ahead—yes, the workers, but also the taxpayers and the economy alike.

#### LEFT BEHIND

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Benghazi whistleblowers have spoken publicly: the administration failed before, during, and after the terrorist attack in Benghazi.

Head of diplomatic security in Libya, Eric Nordstrom, testified his calls for more security before the attack were dismissed by a negligent State Department.

During the attack, counterterrorism official Mark Thompson said that the rescue team was told to stand down instead of trying to save Americans under attack.

Deputy chief of missions in Libya, Greg Hicks, said in his chilling testimony that when Ambassador Stephens frantically called him, they both knew this was a terrorist attack.

The information was reported to Washington; but back on the ranch, the administration ignored the obvious terror attack and blamed the situation on a video. What a yarn. The Libyan President even told our government that this was a terrorist attack, and he was ignored.

The result: four Americans murdered; an administration missing in action

that didn't attempt to rescue Americans; a bungling State Department that misled us; and a Secretary of State testifying, What difference does it make?

The difference it makes, Mr. Speaker, is four Americans were left behind. Shameful.

And that's just the way it is.

#### TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, this week is Teacher Appreciation Week. I rise to appreciate teachers, especially my wife, who is a high school math teacher; and my sister, who teaches gifted and talented students and English as a second language.

But mostly, I arise to really appreciate our teachers. I have three daughters. They have all received great educations, and it's thanks to the teachers who spend so much time, who care about our kids. And the investment we are making in our children through our teachers is the best investment America can make. We have to continue to build our education system and make it the best in the world and keep it that way.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank all of the teachers out there for the hard work that they do every day on behalf of our country, but especially our kids.

□ 1230

#### THE APPS ACT

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of consumer protection and privacy on mobile devices.

Every day, millions of Americans use mobile applications to help us get through the day, but many consumers do not know that their data is being collected. This privacy breach is just not ones and zeros. It's personal information, including our location at any given moment, our photos, messages, and many of the things meant only for our friends and loved ones; yet we lack basic rights to control how and how much of our data is collected on our phones, iPads, and tablets.

Data has become the oil of the 21st century and, like any other resource, there must be commonsense rules of the road for this emerging challenge. Today I'm introducing the APPS Act, a commonsense approach to this urgent challenge. The APPS Act will protect consumers without disrupting functionality or innovation.

Privacy is an issue that should unite us, not drive us apart. I ask that my colleagues come together and support this bill, creating transparency and trust in the mobile marketplace.

### OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM NEEDS HELP

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the education system in our country needs help. But instead of helping education through additional funding, the sequester, which I voted against as a bad idea, cuts education services to the children in our country who are most at risk.

\$740 million will be cut from Title I education programs that provide financial assistance to improve academic achievement of disadvantaged students. Tennessee would receive \$14.5 million less and, in Memphis, almost every single school relies on those funds. Head Start would be stripped of \$406 million.

These programs are relied upon by low-income families, families that need more assistance to assure that their children have a safe place to learn while their parents work to pay their bills.

Nationwide, nearly 1.2 million students are affected by Head Start cuts. Tennessee will lose at least \$7 million and, in Memphis, it means 31,000 children will lose access to affordable early education.

As a result of this reduction in Federal funding and the needs to reprioritize our allocation of Title I funding, Memphis City Schools will be forced to eliminate approximately 80 of their pre-K classrooms for the next year. Eighty-two classrooms are being closed, affecting 1,640 children, more than a third of the students.

The sequester needs to go.

### IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States of House of Representatives. And I know that there's issue after issue that comes before this Congress; some calculate those issues in the thousands. But I'm also aware that, across America, we talk about the things that we see in the news. The things that are in the news are the large topics that are emerging here in Congress.

We've heard the gentleman from Texas speak about the Benghazi incident and how that is unfolding here, and another gentleman talked about the immigration issue, which is unfolding within the Senate and the Judiciary Committee as recently as today.

I come to the floor, Mr. Speaker, to raise the issue of immigration and seek to, I think, more broadly inform yourself and those that are listening in, Members of the Congress, as well. And

it strikes me that we have been through some intense debates here in this Congress on the immigration issue, and primarily that debate that took place starting in 2005, throughout the duration of 2006 and into 2007, when we saw tens of thousands of people come to the Capitol grounds and fill up the west lawn and call for amnesty.

I recall in those days it was President George W. Bush that was promoting this policy. And I remember a discussion with his political director, I believe, the senior political adviser at the time, and he said to me, Well, if we didn't give them amnesty, would it be okay with you?

And I said, Well, first let's define "amnesty."

And he said, Well, it wouldn't be amnesty, for example, if we required people to pay a fine, or if we required them to learn English, or if we required them to get a job, or if we required them to pay their back taxes. And that was the language that emerged here in the middle part of the previous decade.

It happens to also be reflective of the 1986 Amnesty Act, which Ronald Reagan signed. It was one of only two times that that great man let me down in 8 years of the Presidency. Once a term's not too bad. Ronald Reagan intended to follow through on the enforcement of the law and the securing of our border.

I was an employer at the time. I remember the new rules that emerged from the 1986 Amnesty Act. President Reagan was honest enough and direct enough with the American people that he called it amnesty, and we understood that that's what it was.

And we understood the purpose for it, and that was to get an agreement so that we could enforce the law and put away the immigration debate for all time by allowing the people that were illegally in the United States a path to citizenship of full residency status and the path to citizenship, and the trade-off was that would be the last amnesty. The promise that there would never be another one was the 1986 Amnesty Act.

There was something like 800,000 people originally that were to be the beneficiaries of this plan, and it turned out to be not a million—3 million people. There was a substantial amount of document fraud, and there was a larger universe of people than was anticipated.

Does anybody think today, Mr. Speaker, that this universe of people is not larger than that that's anticipated by the Senate version of the comprehensive immigration reform bill?

Of course, honest people, objective people, they're not going to write into the bill that there's only going to be 11 million people that can be beneficiaries of this bill. Any kind of an amendment like that would put a hard cap on, would be a deal breaker in the United States Senate because they know that number's larger. History shows that number is larger. Data shows the number is larger. That's just the lowest

number that they can, with a straight face, talk about, and it's in a calculated way to try to minimize the amount because it minimizes the opposition to this idea that has emerged.

And I understand why it's there for Democrats, Mr. Speaker. I recall this debate. And as likely the year was 2006, I saw it live. I saw it on C-SPAN, but it took place right out here on the west lawn when then-Senator Teddy Kennedy went before throngs of people, speaking through an interpreter, speaking Spanish through an interpreter, he said: Some say report to be deported. I say, report to become an American citizen.

When I heard that, Mr. Speaker, I understood why he said that. This was his clarion call to say to all of them out there: We want to give you citizenship; and the deal is, you need to come and vote. Vote for those who advocate for handing citizenship over in exchange for the implied or implicit.

And we know what has happened with the way that people have been divided, divided from Americanism into special interest groups by using the political science of victimology manufactured in the brain of Antonio Gramsci back in the earlier part of the 20th century, a contemporary of Lenin's who studied in Moscow and went to Italy and sat down and was jailed by Mussolini and wrote his prison notebooks. I've read nearly every word that he has published, Mr. Speaker.

Antonio Gramsci was a brilliant man if you can accept the flawed premise that he started with; and the flawed premise was to accept Karl Marx's theory that they needed to defeat Western civilization and defeat the bourgeoisie and empower the proletariats. That was Marx's.

Gramsci was critical of Marx's theory because he said Marx only isolated himself and focused on just economics, and he didn't believe that the Communist movement could succeed against free enterprise and Western civilization because the proletariats, the common people, the working people, needed the bourgeoisie for jobs, so there was an interdependency there.

So he argued instead, if we're going to defeat them, we have to do the long march through the culture. We have to take on all of these principles that interconnect, that hold Western civilization, Western Christendom, as Winston Churchill described it, or Western Judeo-Christendom, as I would describe it, those values that hold us together completely under assault, strategized by Antonio Gramsci, who was the President of the Communist Party in Italy from 1919 until 1926.

And he was brilliant in his perception. He is the father of multiculturalism. He didn't use the word, that I could find, but he's the father of it.

□ 1240

He created the idea that if you could get people to identify themselves as

victims and be in victims groups, then there will be more energy in a group with a common grievance than there would be in a group of just proletariats that needed a job and wanted a better way of life. So if you could get the focus of the grievance group intensified, then you could bundle the grievance groups up into a movement. Throughout all of that, you could break down Western Civilization, and you could empower the socialist state or the Marxist state. That was Gramsci's writings, Gramsci's teachings.

Some of the people in this Congress actually do know about this man. I think I'm the only one that's actually attempted to read all of his works. But I see it emerge here in the immigration debate. It's part of the effort to divide people—Americans, the giant melting pot, the greatest success story of assimilation the world has ever conceived of.

Why do people come to the United States of America? Because they are inspired by the image of the Statue of Liberty. And within that Statue of Liberty are the basic pillars of American exceptionalism in the minds of the people that see it. They're written into the Bill of Rights, most of them.

Can you imagine being in a foreign country where you're suppressed, where you don't have the rule of law, where you don't have right to property and the right to keep the earnings from the sweat of your brow? In a country like that where you can't trust the press and there's not an open press, can you imagine getting that message from Radio Free Europe, for example, and realizing that in the United States of America you can have—if you can come here, come here legally—you can have freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances. What a wonderful thing to be looking at from someplace in the world where they don't have those kinds of rights.

That's just part of the First Amendment. And then you get to the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms. Why? So that we can defend ourselves from tyranny. That was the one thing that guarantees the balance of the rights.

And looking on down through: the property rights in the Fifth Amendment, the protection against double jeopardy, you get to face a jury of your peers, and then on top of that, these rights that are not specified, the authority of the Federal Government that's not enumerated, devolve to the States or the people respectively.

This means we are an even freer country than we can imagine from reading the Constitution because some States are freer than others. And we compete with each other to offer that level of freedom: economic freedom, social freedom and the freedom to be free from a 16.1-ounce limitation on the size of your Coke, for example. You can

move to another State if you don't like that rule—another city—if you don't like that rule that flows out of New York. That's an example of how this great laboratory of America inspired millions of people all over the world.

So we didn't just get a random cross-section of people that came from Scotland or Germany or Italy or name your country around the world, not a random cross-section. We got the people that were inspired. These are the people that saw the Statue of Liberty.

They had enough access to the real truth because we put the message out because maybe they were interactive with Americans that travel, maybe they interacted with American troops that went to liberate some people. We've always left a positive message wherever we have gone as Americans.

An example of that, Mr. Speaker, was one that caught me by surprise, a very pleasant surprise. Several years ago, I went to a hotel in downtown Washington, D.C., to listen to a speech by then-President of the Philippines, Gloria Arroyo. In that speech, as I listened, here is how it unfolded: She said, thank you, America. Thank you for sending the United States Marine Corps to our islands in 1898. Mr. Speaker, I know you must be thinking, what about the Army? She forgot about the Army, but the Army was there, too.

She said, Thank you, also, for sending your priests and pastors to our islands to help restore and establish our faith. Thank you for sending 10,000 American teachers—if I remember right, she called them Thomasites—who taught the students in the Philippines the English language, the free-enterprise system, a sense of honesty and a work ethic, the American way of life and of being proud of being a worker and a producer and contributing to the GDP.

She said that today there are 1.3 million Filipinos that because they have these skills of language, a work ethic and an understanding of free enterprise, they can travel anywhere in the world to get a job, and they send a lot of that money back to the Philippines. She told us where the percentage of their GDP came from. It came from foreign Filipino workers that contribute to the GDP of the Philippines and to the wealth of the Philippines because more than 100 years ago Americans went there, and we transferred American culture and civilization. It had a significant influence on the Philippines. And they are more successful today. That was her speech to us more than 100 years later to say thank you.

So there is an image of what America was and an image of what I pray America still is. That's an image that is under assault by this philosophy of victimology that was created in the minds and in the writings of Antonio Gramsci. Think about how this thing flowed through. Marx wrote his "Communist Manifesto." Gramsci created his multiculturalism and victimology, and he wrote and taught how you

would use that to undermine our culture and civilization. And he talked about the long march through the culture: break down marriage, break down religious values, and break down truth. That's only three of about 25 on the list.

They have been doing that systematically. I see it come out of this side of the aisle every single day in this Congress. Most of them don't know they're doing that. They're just caught up and swept up in the movement of their political party.

I hear the President reducing and lowering American values by his comments that take place in the public and in the press. Think about the things that he has chosen sides on. For example, when it was Professor Gates and Officer Crowley, Mr. Speaker, we know that, first of all, no President would engage in an incident like that, but he did. And he drove a wedge down between the issues of race.

When Arizona passed their immigration law, S.B. 1070, the President had to do a profile of the type of person that he alleged might be impacted negatively by that bill when the bill itself specifically said that couldn't happen—down the lines of race and ethnicity again.

Then we've got Tim Tebow who will kneel and pray to God on the football field. Meanwhile, we have a professional athlete that decides that he's going to announce his sexuality, and he gets a personal call from the President of the United States to highlight the sexuality of a professional ballplayer.

These are ways that the culture gets undermined, where it gets divided. The people over on this side take their followership from that kind of leadership; and one notch at a time, one click at a time, American civilization, American culture, Western Civilization, Western Judeo-Christendom are eroded. They're carrying out a plan that has been put in place and thought out and advocated for almost now 90-some years ago. They don't know that they're doing it. They think somehow they're providing freedom.

They always want change. They want to change everything that's in place, but there is no goal. If you would grant a wish list to the left and say if I had the power and the magic wand, and I would say, here's the magic wand, I will give you this: you've got all the rest of 2013 to put together the list of all the things that you want to do to fix society, fix America, all the things that possibly could be done from the United States Congress, from the White House, from the judicial branch of government and throughout all of our States down to the lowest municipal judge in this country, or legislative body, city council, for example, give them their entire wish list, you've got all the rest of the year to put that wish list together, and come the stroke of midnight when the ball drops in Times Square, December 31 at midnight, I'm going to stroke the magic

wand and you can have everything your political heart wishes for. But the deal is that now you've got to clam up forever and live underneath the rules that you spent the rest of this year writing.

Mr. Speaker, we know how that would turn out. They would work day and night because they are hard-working people. They are smart people. They start with a flawed premise, but they are smart beyond that. They would work day and night to produce the longest, most complete, expansive list of all the things that the left would want. And it would be the destruction of Western Civilization in the end. But come midnight, if I gave them the stroke of the magic wand, then they would stay up the rest of the night trying to figure out how to argue that somehow they were cheated, that they really needed something else, that they left something out of the list.

They're never going to live with the values they call for because there is no constant of truth for them. They undermine it. There is no constant of faith or values because it always has to be moving. It's got to be transformative to satisfy the people on the left.

Those of us who come from the other side of the aisle, we believe there are eternal truths, that, for example, a sin 2,000 years ago is a sin today. We believe that there is such a thing as truth, there's such a thing as objective truth, and there's such a thing as sound science.

□ 1250

We should adhere to those things that are black and white and live by them, and we should debate the things that are gray. That's the difference between the right and the left.

I believe that if you would grant that power that I've discussed, Mr. Speaker, to those on our side of the aisle, I could probably write you up a set of rules in the next 24 hours that I'd be willing to live with for the rest of my life. And I think that society would gradually move itself back into an ordered forum that would allow human nature and the best of human nature to manifest itself in our families, in our faith, in our communities, in our work, and our rule of law. But what I'm watching here is the undermining of the rule of law with the immigration bill.

This bill that is emerging now that's being debated in the Senate—apparently there's one that's still hidden here in the House somewhere by a hidden committee—this is what the bill does, the Gang of Eight's bill: It grants instantaneous amnesty to everyone who's here in America, and it sends an invitation to everyone who has been deported in the past to apply to come back to America. And it makes an implicit promise that if you came into America after the deadline or if you can get into America—sneak into America—any time in the future, you will be legalized in the next wave of

amnesty. It's only a matter of time. And we will never deport you as long as you don't commit a felony—or if you can mysteriously figure out which of the three misdemeanors would be so offensive that the Gang of Eight would want to send you back home again. That's the bill.

So what do they do to get people to agree, to embrace this huge amnesty bill that is breathtaking in its scope and beyond the imagination of even the people in the Senate a year ago—it's what they wanted, but they wouldn't say it publicly. They never imagined they could actually talk about this broad and expansive an amnesty bill even a year ago.

And the tradeoff is this: we have to legalize people because they're saying that we have *de facto* amnesty. No. We have real amnesty, executive branch-created amnesty in America today. The President has refused to enforce immigration laws. He took an oath to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That's his constitutional responsibility. Whether he agrees with the laws or not, it is his constitutional responsibility to take care that they are faithfully executed.

When he was speaking to a high school here in Washington, D.C., a couple of years ago—the date was March 28, I'm not certain of the year—and they asked him, why don't you, by executive order, pass the DREAM Act that would grant legal status and an in-State tuition discount for those younger people that came into the United States and they're here illegally. His answer was, well, I don't have the authority to do that. Constitutionally, Congress has to pass a law like that. Because, as he explained to them, as a former adjunct constitutional law professor at the University of Chicago—I agreed with the explanation that he gave, which was: Congress passes the laws. It's up to the President to carry out or enforce those laws, and it's up to the courts to rule on what the laws mean. Now, that's a pretty compact synopsis, but I don't disagree with that. I think the President described it right. He said he did not have the power. His power was limited by the Constitution. Congress is empowered to pass immigration laws—that's what Congress has done from the beginning—and the executive branch's job is to enforce it.

Shortly thereafter—that being roughly a year or so later—the President reversed his position and, I believe by his direction, the Department of Homeland Security spit out a memorandum that created four classes of people. These four classes of people were then summarily exempted from the enforcement of immigration law. And seven times in that memorandum they wrote the words “on an individual basis.” “On an individual basis,” because they know that by—I'll just say by consent and agreement, the executive branch can't prosecute every Federal violation. That's why they have

prosecutorial discretion. It's also a matter of case law out there, if you want to accept that term, and I generally don't.

But that directive, I'd grant, the executive branch has to have prosecutorial discretion to determine how best to apply the enforcement and prosecution resources of the executive branch. They can't prosecute every single violation. But prosecutorial discretion only is on an individual basis; it's not on classes of people.

But the President, Janet Napolitano and John Morton created four classes of people and waived the enforcement of the law against those four classes of people. And now, to add insult to injury, these four classes of people that they decided they're not going to enforce the law against, the President created out of thin air a work permit so that they could work in the United States, presumably legally. It's an unconstitutional, lawless work permit that he has created out of thin air, but they are getting those work permits now to work in the United States because the President has crossed the constitutional line, that line between the executive and the legislative branch, article II—and has gone to article I and claimed authority.

Now, when the Founding Fathers constructed this Constitution and they set up these three branches of government—often we're taught they are three equal branches; I would argue that, no, the judicial branch was designed to be the weakest of the three. But that point is not so important here, Mr. Speaker, but it's this: that this Congress passes the laws. The executive branch's job is to enforce the laws. The President has decided he can manufacture laws out of thin air and refused to enforce the laws on classes of people that he's created by memorandum. That, as far as I know, has not happened with another President. There are about five places where he has crossed the line into the legislative branch.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned this: that if you set up—and they did; they set up three branches of government, each with its own constitutional power and authority, each with its own domain. They knew that there were gray areas in between. You can never write something precisely so that it is a very thin bright line. They did as good as could be done with the language that we have—I can applaud them for it, of course. But they envisioned that that grayer line that couldn't quite be bright enough between the legislative and the executive or the legislative and the judicial, that line and that triangle, for example, would always be defended by each side. They never imagined that the judicial branch would be able to claim so much authority over the executive or the legislative. They thought that the legislative branch would push back against the judicial branch of government, for example.

In this Congress, I think it is not well enough informed on its constitutional article I prerogatives. So when the Supreme Court grasps legislative authority out of that that's granted in article I to Congress, seldom do we stand up and claim it back again. And we're so numb to this that when the President of the United States, the executive branch, reaches into article I and claims legislative authority, we can't get our back up in this Congress to put up a fight and tell the President that's an unconstitutional act, you crossed a line, and we're going to pull this thing back and put you back in line and make you keep your oath of office. Now, that's the structure that we have today. And we have some tools that we can use, but we have to have the will.

Mr. Speaker, to bring this around to—I'll call it a sub-conclusion of this discussion—when you look through a constitutional analysis and you look at the maximum authority that could be grabbed by the judicial branch or the executive branch or the legislative branch, what's the restraint on that? Article I is really the strongest branch of government.

The House of Representatives is reactive to the people. It's set up to be an election every 2 years so we can be reactive to the people. An example would be when people lost their good political judgment here in Congress and passed ObamaCare in 2010, we saw a wave election and 87 new freshman Republicans came in. Every single one of them ran on the full repeal of ObamaCare. Every single one of them voted—as did every Republican after that—to repeal ObamaCare. That's just the House reaction.

The Senate didn't transform itself to that extent in the last election. Part of that was also the vision of the Founding Fathers. But they always thought that there would be a tension between the branches of government, that each branch of government would jealously protect its power, and that as that little tug of war went on, those lines would be defined over time and by history by people defending their authority within their respective branch of government. They did not imagine that the United States Congress would capitulate lawmaking to the President of the United States and not draw a bright line and not have a fight. I am troubled by that, Mr. Speaker.

Now we have a President who has manufactured his own immigration law. And now we have people in the United States Senate who are advocating this to this Congress because they declare that we have virtual amnesty in America today. It's not virtual; it's literal. The President created it. And I'm not suggesting that the previous Presidents did a very good job of enforcing the law, but they didn't manufacture immigration law out of thin air. This one did.

□ 1300

He created it. Now, the Senators and Members in this House also are advo-

cating that there is de facto amnesty, and the only thing that we can do is conform the laws to the amnesty that the President has manufactured out of thin air. That's the same thing as conforming this Congress to an order by the Supreme Court.

This Congress is the final answer on this. Whether it's a disagreement with the Supreme Court, whether it's a disagreement with the executive branch, the House and the Senate operating together envisioned by our Founding Fathers would be: we'll sort this out if we have to in the end.

When there's a constitutional clash and a tug of war, that's sorted out by the people expressing their judgment in the ballot box. That's how you eventually resolve serious constitutional crises. So, we have a constitutional serious concern. I'm not to the point where I say it's a crisis at this point.

But, Mr. Speaker, the President has conferred de facto amnesty? No, he's conferred literal, actual factual amnesty. And now we have people that can't think through this constitutionally, so they declare we have to conform with the President's will, wish, or whim. I suggest, no, we have a lot of ways to restrain the President, and I will not go into that today.

I do want to talk about how poor a decision it is to declare that all people in the United States illegally can stay here unless they commit a felony, or those three mysterious misdemeanors that can't be identified at this point, or those that have been deported apply to come back in. If you're not guilty of a felony of some kind, we'll bring you back to America. That's the "we really didn't mean it" clause. And the third one is all of those who are here after the deadline and who can get here after the deadline, never fear, because there is no one who has not committed a felony, nor not committed those three serious mysterious misdemeanors, who is going to be subject to removal from the United States under this President or under the Gang of Eight's bill. That's what we're dealing with.

So, the rule of law, which is the core issue here, it is an essential pillar of American exceptionalism, is under assault by people in the Senate and in the House, and the President of the United States, obviously, who has blown a great big hole in it by his own executive actions. The rule of law.

Now, all those people that are sitting around in the countries of the world that are inspired by the Statue of Liberty that want to come here, many of them are subject to an arbitrary "no rule of law" where they can be stopped and frisked in the streets and where the police can squeeze some dollars out of you just under the threat that you've got a speeding ticket, whether you were or whether you weren't, not a place to defend yourself. They don't think they get justice in a lot of the courts in the world, they don't get justice in the streets, they don't have freedom of speech, they don't have

freedom of religion. And they want to come here because everyone is equal under the law.

Do you remember the statue, Mr. Speaker, of—and it's tricky to say statue here as a Member of Congress. Usually, we say statute. But I'm talking about, actually, a statue of Lady Justice. She's holding the scales of justice and these scales are balanced, they're even. You see the pots hanging from the chains on either side. Generally, when you see her, she's wearing a blindfold, because we have equal justice under the law in the United States.

The image of Lady Justice also attracts good people to come to America because they understand the image of the Statue of Liberty says, freedom, the lamp of liberty shining bright, for all who will come here legally. And Lady Justice blindfolded, equal justice under the law for everybody under the law here in the United States.

To waive the law and to give people a pass and to grant them a path to citizenship for—what is their one virtue that they have? They have access under this thing to all of the welfare systems and benefits that we have in the United States of America today.

Now, I can do this little quiz test, and, if it were fill in the blank, most Members of Congress wouldn't get this right. There are more than 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs in the United States, more than 80.

One hundred years ago—let's just say at the turn of the previous century—we were not a welfare State. When people came here to America and shuffled across the great hall at Ellis Island where my grandmother did—and I know the exact date that she did that; I believe I've stood in the same spot where she did—when they came here, they had to show that they had a means to support themselves, that they were physically healthy enough to work and able to. They were checked physically to see if they happened to be transmitters of contagious diseases at the time.

Even though they were filtered and checked and sorted before they boarded the ship on the European side of this generally, when they arrived at Ellis Island there still were 2 percent that didn't meet the evaluation, and they were sent back to their home country. Still, after the filter was put in place and they arrived here, 2 percent got put back on the boat and sent back again.

We wanted to have a country then—we were a rational country then—that had an immigration policy that was designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States of America. What's wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? Every other country that I know of has a policy like that.

I met with the Canadians yesterday, and I asked them, could I emigrate to Canada, could I meet the standard? They were diplomats, so they didn't exactly say no. But I asked them a whole



series of ways and they absolutely could not say yes, unless I married a Canadian.

Now, I'm not likely to do that. I've been married for 40 years, and I'm real happy with the wife I have. By the way, I love living in the United States and having an opportunity to try to turn this country into an even better place.

But here's the standard that they have. They give you points up there. They want you to be young, they want you to have language skills—that means speak English—they want you to have some capital, some education, and some jobs skills, some earning capacity. Those are the criteria that they use in Canada. These are also similar to the criteria in the United Kingdom and in Australia.

No one has the massive immigration, even as a percentage of their population, that we have here. I've sat on the Immigration Committee for more than 10 years. I've gone to hearing after hearing. I've gone through reams of documents and reports and studies.

Here is some of the under oath testimony from just a few years ago:

Under our legal immigration policy, if you're going to measure the merit of the applicants to legal immigration into the United States and you score it according to the merits of the individual applicant, only between 7 and 11 percent of our legal immigrants are even scored on their ability to contribute to America. All of the rest of them are coming through on something that doesn't have anything to do with their ability to contribute to this society. Seven to 11 percent is all. So 89 to 93 percent of legal immigrants are going to come on something other than merit: family reunification, asylum, visa lottery program, to give you a few. And that's legal, not counting the illegal, which is 40 percent visa overstays and 60 percent illegal border crossings.

What kind of a country would turn its borders over to anybody that could cross them and turn over its legal immigration system to 89 to 93 percent, something other than some way of measuring how they contribute to this country?

So the evaluation is this: that they must conclude—people on that side, people in the Senate, too many people on this side—that every individual has an equal ability to contribute to our society. Well, that's not true.

Robert Rector of The Heritage Foundation gave a presentation of his study yesterday morning for an hour. It was riveting. I have the executive summary of that here, Mr. Speaker, and I have gone through it carefully before his presentation so I was up to speed.

Here's a point that he made—and I've made this point into *THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* as recently as this week—that the libertarian approach to this is just let labor decide how it's going to move across borders, that goods and services and capital should all flow the same way, that we should have an open borders policy so that if

business needed labor they could attract it from anywhere and put it to work wherever they wanted to, the free flow of labor, just like the free flow of capital or the free flow of materials or finished goods.

Now, Milton Friedman made it very clear that an open borders policy cannot coexist with a welfare State. And that State that we had back at the turn of the previous century that my grandmother arrived here within, we were not a welfare State, we were a meritocracy. The Statue of Liberty meant something then, and it meant that you have an access to God-given liberties, constitutionally defined liberties, and that you had the chance to achieve all you could achieve, succeed all you could succeed, and be able to keep a reasonable share of the fruits of your labor.

□ 1310

By the way, that took place also before we had an income tax, Mr. Speaker—no welfare state, no income tax, a meritocracy, and 2 percent got sent back because they didn't meet the standards of being able to sustain themselves in this society. I would also think there would be a few who made their way through who didn't.

In 1900, there was no welfare state; there was no income tax; and we had an immigration policy that was large, and it was so large and the numbers were so great that even then we needed low-skilled and unskilled labor back before we had, let me say, the technical development that we have in our economy today. We did need those laborers then. We needed people to work on farms. We needed people to build railroads and to construct our roads and our highways.

Today, in the United States of America, the highest unemployment rates that we have are in the lowest skilled jobs. So when you see double-digit unemployment, go find the job that requires the least amount of skill, and I can point to you the highest amount of unemployment.

What kind of a nation in its right mind would want to then increase the numbers of the people who are more likely to be unemployed and further suppress the wages of people in those job categories, those low- and unskilled job categories, when we're living in a welfare state that has to sustain these families that cannot possibly earn their own way in this society?

Culture has changed, the economy has changed, and because it has changed, we should be keeping up with what has taken place and understand that it's different today than it was in 1900.

For the most part, this Congress acts like, well, everybody who came here was a contributor to our economy and our society, so there is no limit to the number of people who should come here. I ask them sometimes: How many people should be coming into the United States legally and illegally altogether? What would your annual

limit be? Would you cap that somewhere along the line? What should the population of the United States be in the next decade? In the next generation? In the next half a century? They cannot answer that question. They will not answer that question.

In fact, in a hearing on Ellis Island in that year that I mentioned—I believe that was 2007, April 15 if I'm not mistaken—they had a demographer come testify as an expert witness to explain to us how it works, that because baby boomers are getting older and they will be accessing the retirement benefits of Social Security and Medicare that we needed to import a lot of people into America to pay that Social Security. So that was the argument of the demographer, and it was also the argument of the economist. If I remember right, he was one of the lead economists out of Stanford University.

I asked both of them: What is the optimum demographic by decade or by generation? What should the size of the population be? Is that a perfect column when you stack them each decade of population up? Is it perfect?

The demographer hadn't thought about what was optimum. He just came to tell us what we needed to do, which was to import a lot of people to pay into our Social Security and Medicare because, at some point, it would go the other direction. We know that. It will go bankrupt. The economist, as I remember, from Stanford made the argument also that we can't sustain Social Security and Medicare unless we import a whole lot of people because our birth rate has been going down.

So I asked him the obvious question that, Mr. Speaker, I'm confident you'd be asking yourself right now, and that is: Who is going to pay for the Social Security and Medicare of those people who we would bring in to pay for ours? What's the solution for the next generation?

The answer that I got was essentially that there wasn't an answer for that. That's a problem for the next generation to deal with. This is a generational issue, Mr. Speaker, and it has a lot more to do with what America looks like in the next generation and the next generation than it does about what happens here in the next decade.

Now, it's curious the Senate bill scored as it might be. I've heard the report of Doug Holtz-Eakin that it's going to be an economic boost to our society. You've heard that from the Gang of Eight. It's curious. Why do they kick this out 13 years? Why do those who would be legalized under amnesty in the 13th year then become citizens? It's because they will have access to the welfare state at that period of time. It gets us past the budget window of 10 years so they don't have to account for what it really does. Robert Rector accounts for what it really does. His numbers are appalling, and he has the most refined and careful study that has ever been done on this.

I would take issue with anybody in the Gang of Eight or with anyone who

has advocated there is an economic equation that shows this as a plus and tell you that you have to calculate this for the lifetimes of the people who are affected by it because, if it's a net cost, it's a net cost. I believe I wrote that number down. I know the net number, but the net number is this: they will draw down a little over \$9 trillion in benefits; they will pay something like \$3 trillion in taxes; and there is a net cost to legalizing here in America of \$6.3 trillion over their lifetimes.

These numbers are broken down, and I have looked at the Rector studies in the past. I know this man. He would not leave himself exposed to an illegitimate mathematical calculation or criticism, and I haven't found people who have been able to level one against his numbers, but that's the general number. Here is a statement that is in here that is worthy of putting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker. He is speaking of the universe of the 11 million, which I believe more than doubles if this bill becomes law.

He says: "At every stage of the life cycle—" and he means that of this universe of 11 million "—unlawful immigrants, on average, generate fiscal deficits." That would be benefits that exceed taxes. "Unlawful immigrants, on average, are always tax consumers; they never once generate a 'fiscal surplus' that can be used to pay for government benefits elsewhere in society. This situation obviously will get much worse after amnesty."

That statement stands. It stands clear and it stands strong, and it stands true in every single year of their presence in this country.

So with regard to the argument that this is an economic thing that we must do, I hear Republicans say it's because there's work Americans won't do. Well, I've done a lot of work that some Americans won't do, but I've never found work that I won't do. I've never found work that my sons won't do or work that our construction crews won't do. We are there taking care of some of the things that some have to do, and it's legal people who are doing the work for our company, which I sold to my oldest son several years ago.

I've had them out working in temperatures that were 126 degrees heat index. I've worked out there. I've worked 2 days in a row when it was 60 below windchill, driving sheet piling across a swamp because it was freezing, and we didn't have to mat the dragline. We worked in 186 degrees temperature range and heat index and cold index, windchill index.

We've done all of this work, and it grates on me to hear anybody say there's work Americans won't do. As Americans, we are not too good to do any kind of work that's necessary to do. We might be a little too smart to do some of that kind of work for too little money and too little in benefits; and when we flood the labor supply into the no- and low-skilled jobs, that lowers the wages; it lowers the bene-

fits; and it reduces the numbers of Americans and pushes them out on to our welfare state.

For example, there is a study that I read several years ago that was done in a residential area of Milwaukee. They went in and surveyed a 36-square block residential area, six blocks by six blocks. They went into every home and interviewed them and measured the type of family that was there—the ages, the jobs they did, et cetera. In 36 square blocks, this was a neighborhood of Milwaukee where African Americans had moved up from the gulf in the thirties, at the end of prohibition, to take the jobs in the breweries and in those things that were economically developing in Milwaukee area at the time.

They were good jobs. They moved up there for good jobs. They bought homes in the neighborhoods, and they raised their families there. Three generations later, from, say, the 1930s until the late nineties when I read this report, they had gone from a good work ethic and a mobile family that had moved for a good job and had set up their homes there to where there wasn't a single employed male head of household in the entire 36-block residential area.

□ 1320

And the article that I read lamented that we couldn't bring jobs to them. What kind of a free market society—don't they believe in the free flow of labor and capital? Can't people at least within the United States go to find a job? Now they believe we should move jobs to people rather than let people move to jobs. Why don't people move to jobs? Because we're a welfare state, because we've had 80 different means-tested welfare programs here in this country.

Steve Moore wrote these words years ago when he was with Cato, and I cut it out and laminated it. It isn't an exact quote, but I'll get the theme down, Mr. Speaker. He said:

If you pay people not to work, they won't work. If you pay women to have babies, they'll have babies. If you pay them more if there's not a man in the house, there won't be a man in the house. He might come back and visit, but he won't be registered as living there.

Whatever you pay people to do, they will do. If you pay them not to work, they're not going to work.

There are 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs. I can go through some of the list, but there isn't anybody in this Congress—and I would charge that no one in America can give you that list from memory, which I think proves that there's no one that understands how all of these 80 programs interrelate with each other or how people act or react because of those programs. It's just that one bleeding heart decided this was a good idea and got it put into law, and another one manufactured that one.

Now we have a jigsaw puzzle of welfare programs and a welfare state, and we have advocates for the welfare state

who also advocate for open borders. Why do they do that? I'll take this back to Teddy Kennedy's statement:

Some say report to be deported. I say report to become an American citizen.

It's a political equation for many of the people on the left. They understand that they get votes out of this deal. The people that get to vote out of this deal will know who they need to vote for.

I've talked to those who saw their citizenship process accelerated in 1996. A million people got moved into an early naturalization process in that period of time.

I've talked to people that were beneficiaries of the 1986 amnesty act. They all understood where the political leverage was on this. The people in the 1986 amnesty act say, It was a good idea; it was good for me; it was good for my family, and I think we ought to give it to everybody. And the people in 1996 who had their citizenship accelerated, they knew that it was implied who they were to vote for in the reelection in 1996.

We've seen African Americans moved into a monolithic voting block. Part of that is—let's see. I just suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people on the other side of the aisle understand how to divide people down their lines of race, ethnicity, national origin. It's the grungiest type of victimology: convince people that they're victims, that somehow the man is oppressing them, and the only way you get even with that is income redistribution.

So they push for higher tax rates and more wealth distribution, which discourages the entrepreneur. It discourages the worker. And now it's a public discussion about whether it's smarter to work or smarter to collect welfare, because the welfare dollars go up higher and the reward for moderate skills, let alone the low-skilled and no-skilled jobs, gets lower. And the competition for those jobs gets greater by the people that are in the United States illegally who are living on less than it takes to sustain them, and they are also accessing benefits. That's all in this report, Mr. Speaker.

From my perspective, I'd like to have a network, a support system that keeps people from falling through the cracks. I'd like to have a welfare system, a food stamp program, a way to help people out so that we can bridge them over through the hard times. I'd like to have them do Welfare to Work again.

There was only one of those 80 means-tested welfare programs that was actually Welfare to Work. That was TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. What happened? The President of the United States waived the work requirement arbitrarily, unconstitutionally, where it is specifically written into the bill that it couldn't be waived. He waived it anyway and decided that we're not going to enforce the work requirement in the one single welfare program of the 80 that actually required work.

A lot of people think that welfare was transformed and people on it are required to move towards work. No, unless the States have a way they're doing that in a more effective way than I'm hearing about. In the Federal Government, there is no longer a work requirement. There is an incentive not to work, and we're watching more and more families become the second and the third and maybe even the fourth generation who have lived on these programs.

Where do they learn their work ethic? Where do their children learn their work ethic? Who's pushing them? Who's showing them the rewards and pride of being industrious and productive and creative and the responsibility that we have to the broader society?

Each one of us has a little cell in a giant spreadsheet. That giant spreadsheet has over 300 million cells in it, people, Americans living here. We have skills that are God-given and gifts. And, yes, we are a product of our genes and our environment, and the product of that together makes us who we are. But we have a responsibility to contribute to the broader society and understand where we fit in that giant spreadsheet, and we have a responsibility to work, earn, save, invest, and leave this world a better place than it was when we came, and hopefully raise our children with those values to be even stronger and even better than the values we were raised with.

This huge hammock that used to be a safety net that we call the "welfare system" is eroding that. The contempt for the rule of law that spills out of the debate in the United States Senate and here in the House of Representatives erodes our American way of life. How do we think that we can move America beyond the shining city on the hill to another level of our destiny at an altitude higher and better and clearer and more pure and more industrious and more productive with more freedom and a better example for Western Judeo-Christianity if we're going to continue to reward people for not contributing to that value in their single cell in that spreadsheet of over 300 million Americans?

We've got a responsibility to use these gifts that we have. Let's go to work. Let's strengthen our values. Let's strengthen our families. Let's protect the rule of law. Let's not tell ourselves that there's a goal here of political expediency, that somehow because a couple of talking heads woke up the morning after the election and concluded that if Mitt Romney had just not said the words "self-deport" he would be the President of the United States today and so now we have to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill in order to send a message to start a conversation so that in the next election or some subsequent election a Republican can win a national election again.

Who comes to that conclusion? There's no data out there that supports

that. That's just simply a belief that has been created and it's self-perpetuating, but it cannot sustain itself when you look at exit polls, when you look at public survey polls.

Yes, I know a good number of people that they're talking about. I know people who are here legally and illegally who have got a good work ethic. They're good entrepreneurs. They're good family people. They've got values that are a credit to the United States of America, although they broke the law to get here. They've got values that are a credit to our country. I know some of them, and I see those faces. I can see them in my mind's eye, and I can see it in the children that come to our schools.

There's a school in my district that's 85 percent minority, and 65 percent of them came to school on their first day not speaking English. It's never the kids' fault. It's never their fault. It's our fault. It's the fault of the adults that are supposed to be running this country, protecting and restoring the rule of law. That's the responsibility.

But this is not going to be fixed by the legislature. It's not going to be fixed by the United States Congress. We can't pass a promise to enforce the borders and trade it off for perpetual amnesty and think somehow we've got a deal that's going to make this a better country and now we can restore the rule of law. We cannot. The only way you can restore the rule of law is to enforce the law.

The President has decided that he will refuse to enforce the law, and it makes it clear to me—and it should be clear to everybody in this country that is watching this issue—that this is not a legislative problem. The legislature cannot fix the problem that is of the President of the United States making his refusal to abide by his own oath of office and take care that the laws are faithfully enforced. It is an executive branch problem. We can do some things to rein him in, but it's very difficult with the majority and the Senate being run by HARRY REID.

So, practically speaking, Mr. Speaker, it's up to the American people. The American people have to be well-informed. They will draw good judgments when they're well-informed. The American people need to speak up. I hope the American people don't need to rise up to answer this and say: Our ancestors came here. We came here. We followed the law. We got in line according to the law. We didn't ask for amnesty. We went forward and received our naturalization papers after we had met those qualifications.

I've spoken at a good number of naturalization ceremonies. It's a very rewarding experience to do so.

□ 1330

The people that came here the right way that followed our laws are the ones that respect our laws today. The people that had disrespect for our laws, if they're rewarded for breaking them,

how much respect will they have for any of our other laws? Will they be like the President to pick and choose the law that he likes? I suggest, no. Lady Justice is blind. Not only blind, it doesn't matter what economic status or what cultural status you might have or how much influence you might have in your community, justice is blind before the law.

Also, we need to make sure that all laws are applied to all of us equally, that we don't exempt people from them, reward them for breaking them. In fact, Robert Rector put it this way. He said everyone who would be given amnesty under this—this 11 million that I think is 20 or more million—their only claim to all of these welfare benefits and the benefits of living in American society and civilization, their only claim, is that they broke our laws.

So the definition of "amnesty," Mr. Speaker, is this: to grant someone amnesty is to pardon immigration law breakers and reward them with the objective of their crime. That's what amnesty is.

The proponents of the 844-page bill, the Gang of Eight in the Senate and the secret committee in the House, they understand that. They understand it; that's why they keep denying their bill is amnesty. There's no rational analysis that says otherwise, Mr. Speaker.

And so I urge the American people, through my counsel with you in this speech, to take a good look at the Rector study. The Heritage Foundation released it this past Monday at 11 a.m., and it's titled, "The Fiscal Cost of Unlawful Immigrants and Amnesty to the U.S. Taxpayer," dated May 6, 2013. That good study will inform a lot of Americans.

We're going to have another immigration debate, and I'm going to suggest that the American people in their sound judgment will come down on the side of the rule of law, the Constitution, and what's good for the best long-term interest of America, the best economic, social, and cultural benefit of the United States of America, with passion and with compassion for all people who should live with God-given dignity.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLORES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of speaking at graduation ceremonies at Texas A&M University.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until Monday, May 13, 2013, at 2 p.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1429. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0307; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-079-AD; Amendment 39-17410; AD 2013-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1430. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0306; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-049-AD; Amendment 39-17417; AD 2013-07-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1431. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Self Reporting of Out-of-State Convictions [Docket No.: FMCSA-2012-0172] (RIN: 2126-AB43) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1432. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Area R-6601; Fort A.P. Hill, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0561; Airspace Docket No. 12-AEA-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1433. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Portland-Hillsboro, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1142; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-25] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1434. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-266; AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1295; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1435. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; St. Helena, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0283; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-3] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1436. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Astoria, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0853; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-23] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1437. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Omak, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1247; Airspace Docket

No. 12-ANM-27] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1438. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Lakeview, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1254; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-28] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1439. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Reno, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1195; Airspace Docket No. 12-AWP-7] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1440. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1131; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-34-AD; Amendment 39-17440; AD 2013-08-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1441. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0810; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-195-AD; Amendment 39-17420; AD 2013-08-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1442. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0004; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-17390; AD 2013-05-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1443. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1036; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-17408; AD 2013-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1444. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH & Co. KG Rotax Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0263; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-17416; AD 2013-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1445. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1148; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-039-AD; Amendment 39-17405; AD 2013-07-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1446. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1217; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-39-AD; Amendment 39-17414; AD 2013-07-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1447. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1042; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-094-AD; Amendment 39-17413; AD 2013-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1448. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0196; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-03-AD; Amendment 39-17376; AD 2013-05-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1449. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1094; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-070-AD; Amendment 39-17412; AD 2013-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1450. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0497; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-140-AD; Amendment 39-17415; AD 2013-07-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1451. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0933; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-107-AD; Amendment 39-17411; AD 2013-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1452. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1297; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-100-AD; Amendment 39-17285; AD 2012-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 1900. A bill to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 1901. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for extensions of detention of certain aliens ordered removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 1902. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for timely access to post-mastectomy items under Medicare; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. ENYART):

H.R. 1903. A bill to direct that certain coal mine safety grant funds be directed to study the prevention and treatment of Black Lung Disease; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FORBES, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1904. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees of certain sensitive military operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1905. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of Mother's Day; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1906. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to modify provisions relating to the length and weight limitations for vehicles operating on Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 1907. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RADEL, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 1908. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act relating to the premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Com-

merce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 1909. A bill to amend the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 to make improvements to the trade promotion policies and programs of the United States Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1910. A bill to require foreign manufacturers of products imported into the United States to establish registered agents in the United States who are authorized to accept service of process against such manufacturers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself and Ms. FOX):

H.R. 1911. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 1912. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for participation in the Exchange of the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, political appointees, and Congressional staff; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 1913. A bill to provide for greater transparency in and user control over the treatment of data collected by mobile applications and to enhance the security of such data; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1914. A bill to ban guns for persons who have been convicted of stalking or who are subject to a court order restraining the person from stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 1915. A bill to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 1916. A bill to require the collection of up-to-date information on tariff and non-tariff laws, regulations, and practices of foreign countries affecting exports of United States goods and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1917. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DENT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BONNER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LONG, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1918. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on beer to its pre-1991 level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTI (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 1919. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the pharmaceutical distribution supply chain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1920. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a delay in the implementation schedule of the reductions in disproportionate share hospital payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1921. A bill to repeal the exemption for hydraulic fracturing in the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 1922. A bill to limit assistance to Iran, North Korea, Syria, Egypt, and Pakistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Ms. CHU, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 1923. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the eligibility of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region for designation for participation in the visa waiver program for certain visitors to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 1924. A bill to reinstate year-round Federal Pell Grants under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1925. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require criminal background checks, inspections, and training of child care providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. CHU, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 1926. A bill to further enhance the promotion of exports of United States goods and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 1927. A bill to provide congressional direction for implementation of the Endangered Species Act as it relates to operation of the Central Valley Project and the California State Water Project and for water relief in the State of California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1928. A bill to clarify the calculation of cohort default rates for proprietary institutions of higher education under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 1929. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to carry out pilot projects to reduce dependency and increase work effort in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1930. A bill to prohibit the manufacture, marketing, sale, or shipment in interstate commerce of products designed to assist in defrauding a drug test; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 1931. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1932. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to restore integrity to and strengthen payment limitation rules for commodity payments and benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 1933. A bill to provide assistance and opportunity for the creation and support of sustainable agriculture activities in America's cities and to improve access to nutrition in America's cities; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. BARBER, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 1934. A bill to expand the boundary of Saguaro National Park, to study additional land for future adjustments to the boundary of the Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1935. A bill for the relief of John Castellano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1936. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Merchant Mariner Equity Compensation Fund to provide benefits to certain individuals who served in the United States merchant marine (including the Army Transport Service and the Naval Transport Service) during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1938. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who are diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury have access to hyperbaric oxygen therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1939. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to establish lifelong learning accounts programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOEBACK (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1940. A bill to establish an Office of Specialized Instructional Support in the Department of Education and to provide grants to State educational agencies to reduce barriers to learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1941. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 regarding reasonable break time for nursing mothers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1942. A bill to assure quality and best value with respect to Federal construction projects by prohibiting the practice known as bid shopping; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1943. A bill to establish a task force to review policies and measures to promote, and to develop best practices for, reduction of short-lived climate pollutants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1944. A bill to protect private property rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1945. A bill to extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program of the Department of the Treasury for 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend the Federal Direct Loan Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for student loan affordability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CHU, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. MOORE):

H.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 210. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in remembrance of the victims and in honor of the veterans of the peacekeeping mission in Beirut, Lebanon, from 1982 to 1984; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 211. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of October 7 through October 13, 2013, as "Naturopathic Medicine Week" to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 1900.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1901.



Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 1902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 1906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 1908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 1911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 1912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution

This states that "Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." The power to lay and collect taxes is the power to establish taxes to be placed on the American public, to foster the common good. The Supreme Court in deliberating the constitutionality of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Public Law No: 111-148; ruled that the individual mandate requiring the purchase of health insurance was a tax. Therefore, establishing criteria for the purchase falls under the jurisdiction of Article 1.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 1918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the United States Constitution—"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises."

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Taxation: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 and 18 of Article, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which read, respectively, "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;" and "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States).

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 1927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 1929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (the necessary and proper clause)

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 1931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 & 18.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 1933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority for the Act is derived from Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (clause 14), which grants Congress the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 1939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 1940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, which reads: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 1943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 1.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, including Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 1946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.J. Res. 43.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Its power to propose Amendments to the United States Constitution for ratification by the several states, in accordance with its powers under Article V of the United States Constitution.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 24: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 164: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 207: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 258: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 288: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 309: Mr. SALMON, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 312: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 324: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 362: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 363: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 395: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 416: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 419: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 481: Mr. McKEON.

H.R. 498: Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 506: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 509: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 510: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 511: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 519: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 525: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 532: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 597: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 610: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 611: Mr. TONKO and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 615: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 630: Mr. GIBSON and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 640: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 644: Mr. LANCE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 645: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 647: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 654: Mr. STEWARD.

H.R. 669: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 671: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 679: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.

H.R. 684: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 718: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 755: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 764: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.

H.R. 765: Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 769: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SIREN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESTY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 794: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 800: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 831: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 858: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 863: Ms. HAHN and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 889: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 915: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 919: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 938: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. KIND, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 942: Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. PIN-GREE of Maine.

H.R. 975: Mr. BARBER, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. Neal, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 984: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1000: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1009: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1020: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1026: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1027: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1078: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1106: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1129: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1130: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1141: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1150: Mr. WELCH, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FARR, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CHU, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1154: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1155: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1180: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1186: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1187: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1229: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1247: Mr. WELCH and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1250: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1271: Mr. HOLT, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1282: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1289: Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1332: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1389: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1414: Ms. ESTY, Mr. BERA of California, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1440: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1452: Mr. R. LIPINSKI and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1464: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1518: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FARR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1528: Mr. GIBBS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1563: Mr. JONES, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HARPER.  
 H.R. 1565: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 1572: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 1573: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1593: Mr. COSTA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MORAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 1595: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 1627: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 1632: Mr. GIBBS.  
 H.R. 1635: Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 1648: Mr. TAKANO.  
 H.R. 1652: Mr. VELA.  
 H.R. 1661: Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 1690: Mr. VELA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. MENG.  
 H.R. 1692: Mr. HOLT and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 1699: Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 1706: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 1724: RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. COFFMAN.  
 H.R. 1727: Mr. SABLAN.  
 H.R. 1729: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.  
 H.R. 1755: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. VELA.  
 H.R. 1759: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. LEE of California.  
 H.R. 1761: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1772: Mr. HECK of Nevada.  
 H.R. 1779: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 1781: Mr. KEATING and Mr. CRAMER.  
 H.R. 1805: Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
 H.R. 1807: Mr. PETERS of California.  
 H.R. 1814: Mr. BARTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NEAL, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
 H.R. 1823: Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 1824: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 1825: Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
 H.R. 1826: Mr. GOHMERT.  
 H.R. 1828: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1829: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. NUNNELEE.  
 H.R. 1830: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. TAKANO.  
 H.R. 1833: Mr. TAKANO.  
 H.R. 1837: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 1848: Mr. HANNA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
 H.R. 1857: Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 1864: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAINES, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1870: Mr. ROKITA.  
 H.R. 1874: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. PAULSEN.  
 H.R. 1896: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H. Res. 90: Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
 H. Res. 94: Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H. Res. 102: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MORAN.  
 H. Res. 112: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H. Res. 147: Mr. KILMER.  
 H. Res. 179: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
 H. Res. 182: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H. Res. 187: Mr. COSTA.  
 H. Res. 190: Mr. ENYART, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.  
 H. Res. 197: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H. Res. 200: Mr. REED, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COOK, Mr. MESSER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. CRAMER.

---

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Ms. DeLAURO on H.R. 377: DANIEL LIPINSKI AND EDWARD J. MARKEY.